

VOTES FOR WOMEN.

EDITED BY FREDERICK & EMMELINE PETHICK LAWRENCE.

VOL. II., No. 34.

OCTOBER 29, 1908.

Price 1d. Weekly. (Post Free.)

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Dedication	65
The Outlook	65
Messages from the Leaders	66
N.W.S.P.U. Announcements	66
Programme of Events	66
The Scottish Women Graduates	66
History of the Suffrage Movement. By Sylvia Pankhurst	67
The Prisoners at Bow Street	68-73
Seventeen Women Go to Prison	74
The Arrests for Distributing Handbills	74
Extracts from the Press	75
Victory. By Emmeline Pethick Lawrence	76
The Speeches from the Dock	77-83
"The Soul of the Movement"	83
The Campaign Throughout the Country:—	
West of England — Lancashire — Yorkshire — Midlands —	
Newcastle—Scotland	84
Local Notes	86
Treasurer's Note	87
Contributions to the £20,000 Fund	87

Articles and news contributed for insertion in "Votes for Women" should be sent to the Editors at the earliest possible date, and in no case later than first post Monday morning prior to the publication of the paper.

Subscriptions to the paper should be sent to The Publisher, "Votes for Women," 4, Clements Inn, Strand, W.C.

The terms are 6s. 6d. annual subscription, 1s. 8d. for one quarter, post free, payable in advance.

DEDICATION.

To the brave women who to-day are fighting for freedom: to the noble women who all down the ages kept the flag flying and looked forward to this day without seeing it: to all women all over the world, of whatever race, or creed, or calling, whether they be with us or against us in this fight, we dedicate this paper.

THE OUTLOOK.

Compared with the great trial at Bow-street, which ended in the imprisonment of Mrs. Pankhurst, Miss Christabel Pankhurst, and Mrs. Drummond, all other happenings sink into insignificance. That great event, which is destined to become historic, is filling the thoughts and the hearts of all members of the Women's Social and Political Union, not with sorrow or regret, but with a great feeling of triumph that these three women have dared so much for the great cause of their sex.

Realising the intense interest which this case has aroused, we have made special arrangements, and by increasing our issue to 24 pages are able to present to our readers a verbatim account of the speeches from the dock, as well as a full description of the examination of the witnesses. The speeches will be read with profound interest. They will evoke from the hearts of women all over the world an intense admiration and a fierce courage, and we know that the end for which these women have fought cannot now be long delayed.

Support in the Press.

In last week's issue we called attention to hostile notes in the Press, and remarked that in matters of reform there were four stages—the first was that of neglect, the second of ridicule, the third of vigorous opposition, and the fourth of active support. In this week's issue, on page 75, we reproduce articles from three of the leading London journals, which show that in

their case support is already being obtained. We call special attention to the article in the *Daily Telegraph*, which shows wise statesmanship and true political insight.

A Great Wrong.

The trial will rouse intense indignation. The story of how the Government attempts to corrupt the fountain of British justice, and imposes sentences which the magistrate has to carry out, will be read with the utmost disgust. The exposure by Christabel Pankhurst of their method of procedure, which denies the women the right of trial by jury; allows a magistrate to give a mock decision of ordering the prisoners to be bound over; enables him to place political prisoners in the second division along with common criminals, in order to prevent communication with the outside world—all these things will serve their turn in showing up the degradation into which the present Government have sunk. Public opinion is rapidly turning against them, and the time is not far distant when they must bow to the storm or be broken by it.

Liberals in Name Only.

In addition to the leaders of the movement, 17 other women have been sent to prison for their part in the proceedings on Tuesday, October 13. They, also, are placed in the second division. They will serve their time, and when they come out they will take their part in showing up the hypocrisy of men who, while they cling to the name of Liberal, trample every Liberal principle in the dust.

At the Queen's Hall.

On Monday afternoon, at the usual weekly At Home, a crowded audience listened to speeches by Mr. and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence and Miss Sylvia Pankhurst. "Work, not words," was the keynote of the gathering, and in response to an appeal many offers of help were forthcoming. Miss Mordan promised to give ten pounds each month until Mrs. Pankhurst comes out of prison. Mrs. McCalmont promised £50. Others promised three months' income, others various sums, others promised work, others volunteered to question Cabinet Ministers. Including the collection, a total sum of over £300 was put together.

Bringing Pressure to Bear on Cabinet Ministers.

The space which we have devoted to the great trial leaves little room for other important events of the week. Our readers, however, will be interested to know that the first blow against the Government since the trial was struck on Monday, when a speech of Mr. Sidney Buxton's at Poplar was completely prevented by the interruptions of the women Suffragists. Since their treatment of the leaders no ruth and no mercy of any kind whatever will be shown Cabinet Ministers when they come before the country.

Other Interesting Events.

Another feature of public interest during the week has been that a great Suffrage demonstration was held in Manchester by the non-militant Suffrage societies, and was attended by large masses of citizens of the country. At High Wycombe, a lady (Miss Dove) has been appointed Mayor—the first time that this honour has been conferred on a woman. We regret to see that there is a move amongst certain citizens of the town to upset this appointment. Another lady, well known to us, Mrs. Garrett Anderson, M.D., has been approached to know whether she will stand as the Mayor of Aldeburgh. As a protest against the obstinacy and tyranny of the Government, many Liberals are leaving the party, the Margate Women's Liberal Association has been dissolved, the president of the Kingston and District Women's Liberal Association has resigned her position, and the vicar of a London parish, who was the vice-president of a London Liberal and Radical Association, has also withdrawn from the party. Owing to a pressure on our space, a letter which we have received in answer to Miss Ogston's letter of last week is being held over, and will be dealt with as soon as space permits.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEADERS.

MRS. PANKHURST.

In saying good-bye to our dear organisers and workers I want to say to them that I wish Mrs. Lawrence to take my place while I am away. I shall be sustained by the assurance that Mrs. Lawrence will have their unswervingly loyal support in the work for the cause which it will be left for her to decide upon and initiate. I know that when the three months are over I shall find the Union stronger and more united than ever before.

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

The Government are acting unconstitutionally in denying the vote to women taxpayers, and for our protest against this wrong we are imprisoned. But their method of coercion will not crush our spirit. While we are in prison our agitation will increase with vigour, and when all come out we shall break down the obstinate and futile resistance of this reactionary Government.

"GENERAL" DRUMMOND.

Let your protest resound against the injustice of the Government by redoubled energy in the work.

N.W.S.P.U. ANNOUNCEMENTS.

The Albert Hall Meeting.

The great meeting which will be held in the Albert Hall this evening will take the form of a protest made against the disgraceful action of the Government in imprisoning the leaders of the N.W.S.P.U. The chair will be taken by Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, who will be supported by Miss Mary Gawthorpe, Mrs. Baines, and Mr. Pethick Lawrence. The following resolution will be put to the meeting:—

"That this mass meeting of women congratulates Mrs. Pankhurst, Miss Christabel Pankhurst, Mrs. Drummond, and the other brave women upon their courageous and magnificent fight against oppression, and demands of the Government their immediate release. The meeting further warns the Government that coercion will only fire women to sterner opposition, and that they cannot end the struggle, except by securing the passage of the Women's Enfranchisement Bill into law this Session."

There is every reason that this meeting will be packed from the floor to the ceiling. At the time of going to press there are a few seats still unsold. The prices are 5s., 2s. 6d., 1s., and 6d. Application should be made for these at once. They will be on sale during the morning and afternoon at 4, Clements Inn, W.C., and can be had from the Ticket Secretary. In the evening they will be obtainable from the box-office at the Albert Hall. The meeting, as a whole, is for women only, but the 5s. seats in the stalls are open to men. The organisation of the stewarding is in the hands of Miss Jessie Kenney, who will be the superintendent of stewards.

Everyone should make a point of coming in uniform, and should wear the white dress, decorated with the colours. No headgear, unless a scarf of purple, white, and green. Let no one consider this a small matter. It is a matter of love and loyalty and of pride in our Union.

At Homes in the Queen's Hall.

Readers of VOTES FOR WOMEN are reminded that a public At Home is held every Monday afternoon in the Queen's Hall from 3 to 5, women being specially invited. Previous to the meeting there will be an organ recital by Mrs. Layton, F.R.C.O., who has kindly undertaken the position of honorary organist to the N.W.S.P.U. Next Monday the speakers will be Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, and Mr. Pethick Lawrence. Owing to the very large number of N.W.S.P.U. meetings which have to be announced at the Queen's Hall, the committee desire it to be understood that no handbills, announcements of meetings, &c., can be given out at the hall except those specially authorised.

The Woman's Press.

A new pamphlet has just been published, entitled, "The Militant Methods," by Miss Christabel Pankhurst, price 1d. Orders for this should be sent in at once.

"Votes for Women" Bound Volume.

The bound volume of the first year of VOTES FOR WOMEN is now ready, and can be obtained from the Publisher, 4, Clements Inn, price 10s. (post free, 10s. 6d.). The volume includes the seven monthly and 22 weekly numbers, portraits of Mrs. Pankhurst and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, and also a specially prepared index. The binding is in the colours of the Union, and on the outside cover is a special design by Miss Sylvia Pankhurst.

PROGRAMME OF EVENTS.

Up to November 7 (as far as at present arranged).

October	Wood Green, Small Unity Hall, Wolverhampton, At Home, The Baths Assembly Rooms	Bowes Park W.S.P.U. Miss Keevil, Miss L. Bradburn	2.45-4.15 3.30 p.m.
Thur. 29	Manchester, Openshaw	Mrs. Martel	7.30 p.m.
	London, Albert Hall, Women's Meeting	Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, Miss Gawthorpe, Mrs. Baines, Mr. Pethick Lawrence	8 p.m.
Fri. 30	Birmingham, Carlyle and Dunlop Factory	Miss Keevil, Mrs. B. Smith	1.30 p.m.
	Kensington, Open-air Meeting	Mrs. H. Rowe	7 p.m.
	Hammersmith, Down Place	Miss New	7 p.m.
	Walsend, Women's Meeting, I. L. P. Room	Miss Naylor, Miss Haig	7.30 p.m.
	Wandsworth, East Hill	Miss Conolan	7.30 p.m.
	Glasgow, Hamilton Crescent	Miss Annie Kenney	8 p.m.
	Literary Debating Society	Mrs. Martel, Miss Mary Gawthorpe, Mr. Granville-Barker	8 p.m.
	Clifton, Hannah More Hall	Miss Isabel Seymour	10.30
	Manchester, At Home, Onward Buildings		
	Chelsea, Quizzers' Literary and Debating Society		
Sat. 31	Manchester, Stevenson Square	Manchester Members	1.30 p.m.
	Glasgow, At Home, 141, Bath St.	Miss Conolan	3.30 p.m.
	Fulham, Parson's Green	Miss Naylor, Miss Barry	7.30 p.m.
	Birmingham, Physical Training College, Erdington	Miss Keevil, Dr. Helen Jones	8 p.m.
	Newcastle, Haymarket	Miss New	8 p.m.
Nov.			
Sun. 1	Blackbeath Common	Miss H. D. Ogston	3 p.m.
	Birmingham, Small Heath Park Gates	Dr. Helen Jones, Miss H. Zel	3 p.m.
	Glasgow, Alexandra Parade, United Free Church	Miss Conolan	8 p.m.
	Dialley	Mrs. Martel	
Mon. 2	Birmingham, Perry's Factory	Miss Keevil, Mrs. B. Smith	1.30 p.m.
	London, At Home, Queen's Hall	Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, Miss Sylvia Pankhurst	3-1
	East Finchley, Congregational Literary Society	Miss Ogston	
	Harlesden, Lectures	Mrs. Martel	
	Manchester, Old Trafford	Miss Annie Kenney	3.30 p.m.
	Bristol, Victoria Rooms, At Home		
	Birmingham, At Home, 14, Ethel Street	Miss Keevil, and others	7.30 p.m.
	Newcastle, Bigg Market	Miss New	7.30 p.m.
	Crouch Hill, N. 11, Warblersville Road	Miss Howe, Miss Bonwick	8 p.m.
Tues. 3	Chingford	Miss Ogston	
	South Croydon, Literary Society	Miss Hannah Lightman	
	Birmingham, Kynoch's Factory	Miss Keevil	1.30 p.m.
	Birmingham, Debate	Mrs. B. Smith, Miss Hazel	7.30 p.m.
	Bristol, Barton Hill Adult School	Miss Annie Kenney	8 p.m.
	Liverpool	Mrs. Martel	7.30 p.m.
Wed. 4	Newcastle, At Home, Crosby's Cafe, Northumberland St.	Miss New	5 and 8
	Kensington, At Home	Kensington W.S.P.U.	4-6
	Bristol, Horse Fair	Miss Annie Kenney	7.30 p.m.
	Manchester, Members' Meeting, 116, Portland Street		8 p.m.
	Birmingham, Town Hall	Miss Keevil, Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, Dr. Helen Jones	8 p.m.
	Chelsea, 4, Trafalgar Studios	Committee Chelsea W.S.P.U.	8-9.30
	Glasgow, Kilmyle Literary and Debating Society	Miss Conolan	8.15 p.m.
Thur. 5	Crouch End, Fern Park Institute	Miss Bonwick	
	Wolverhampton, At Home, Baths Assembly Rooms	Miss Keevil	3.30 p.m.
	Bristol, Law Students' Debate, Queen's Hotel	Miss Annie Kenney, Miss Macaulay	7.30 p.m.
	Wood Green, Small Unity Hall, Public Meeting	Bowes Park W.S.P.U.	8-10
	London, At Home, Portman Rooms, Dorset Street	Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, and others	8 p.m.
Fri. 6	Battersea, Polytechnic, Literary Debating Society	Miss Macaulay	
	Walsend, Women's Meeting, I. L. P. Room	Miss New	7 p.m.
	Clifton, Hannah More Hall		
	Bristol, Debate, Church Lecture Hall, St. James Parade	Miss Annie Kenney	8 p.m.
	Manchester, At Home, Moseley Portico Library		8-10
	Glasgow, Polmadie United Free Church Debating Society	Miss Conolan	8.30 p.m.
Sat. 7	Newcastle, Haymarket	Miss New	8 p.m.
	Glasgow, 141, Bath Street	Sale of Work	

IMPORTANT FUTURE EVENTS.

Bristol, Colston Hall Nov. 20
Manchester, Free Trade Hall Nov. 25

THE SCOTTISH WOMEN GRADUATES.

The Scottish women graduates' appeal to the House of Lords now stands tenth on the list of causes down for hearing; but as the Lords take these cases in the order they please, it may be called at any time. The probability is, however, that it will be heard at the end of next week.

Instead of employing counsel, two of the graduates will plead the case in person—Frances H. Simpson, M.A., and Chrystal Macmillan, B.Sc., M.A. Miss Simpson, before the opening of the Scottish Universities to women, studied at the classes provided by the Edinburgh Association for the University Education of Women. In 1892, when these Universities admitted women, she was among the first to receive a degree from the University of Edinburgh. Since 1895 she has been Warden of Masson Hall, the residence for women students of that University. Miss Macmillan holds the degrees of B.Sc., with special distinction in mathematics, and M.A., with Honours in mental and moral philosophy.

The appeal is made in consequence of the adverse decisions given in the Court of Session at Edinburgh in July, 1906, and November, 1907.

THE HISTORY OF THE SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT.

By SYLVIA PANKHURST. XXXI.—*The General Election.*

The W.S.P.U. now began to prepare their plan of campaign for the General Election. Their object was to make the question of Votes for Women one of the vital issues before the country. As yet, however, the members of the Union were few in number, and since most of them were working women they were heavily handicapped by lack of time and means. They knew that they must expect no help from either Press or politicians, and that the only thing to be done was to skilfully organise their forces and to strike boldly at strategic points.

Had it been possible they would have opposed the election of every Government nominee, or, at any rate, of every member of the then Government. As it was, they decided to question in public meetings as many Cabinet Ministers as they could, and to carry out a definite election campaign against one member of the Government—Mr. Winston Churchill.

Mr. Churchill was not, of course, selected from any motives of personal animosity, but simply because he was candidate for a constituency in Manchester where the home and the greatest influence of the W.S.P.U. at that time lay.

All through the Christmas holidays at Mrs. Pankhurst's house in Nelson-street, Manchester, they were busy making white calico banners, and inscribing them in black letters with the fateful words "Votes for Women" and "Will the Liberal Government give the vote?"

On January 4 Mr. Asquith addressed a great public meeting in the Drill Hall, Sheffield. The Union had obtained tickets, and two of us went over early in the day. We saw some of the Sheffield women, who, as soon as they understood our tactics, readily agreed to back us up in anything we might do. We had learnt by this time that if we wanted an answer there was no use in waiting until the speeches were done, and so, soon after Mr. Asquith began to speak, Annie Kenney got up and questioned him, but Mr. Asquith remained silent. She was immediately pulled down, and in an instant was carried out by three or four policemen. The woman who rose to protest against this treatment was ejected with even greater dispatch, and the Sheffield women who sat in the free seats were also turned out of the meeting.

Outside the hall we saw that a Mr. Soutter, a Liberal-Labour man, who had been Miss Helen Taylor's election agent when she stood as a candidate for Parliament, was holding an overflow meeting in support of the Government. We asked him to allow us to get upon his lorry and explain our action. He agreed, and after speaking to the crowd we found that they were entirely with us. A resolution calling upon the Government to give women the vote was unanimously carried. After this Mr. Soutter said that he was quite sure the Liberal Government would give us the vote, but if they did not do so within six months he, for one, should come out and work against them.

On the same evening Mr. Winston Churchill had opened his election campaign. A question as to the Government's intentions on the subject of women's suffrage had been put to him, but he had refused to give any reply. The following night he had arranged to hold several meetings in halls in different parts of his constituency, and as the intentions of the W.S.P.U. were now very well known considerable excitement and expectation prevailed.

The first of these meetings was crowded. The solitary delegate from the W.S.P.U. seated herself in the middle of the hall unnoticed, but a body of half-a-dozen ladies in a little gallery attracted considerable attention. "There they are." "Those are the Suffragists," "Look up there," were the whispers from all quarters. "Yes," said a man calling his neighbour's attention to an elderly grey-haired lady, "that's Miss Pankhurst. She's aged very much since I saw her last. The ladies have got their eye on us all; they'll begin to put their questions soon." The meeting, however, was dull and quiet through the chairman's remarks and the first few speeches.

Then Mr. Winston Churchill came in. He spoke of the unsatisfactory behaviour of the last Government, the will of the people, he said, had been ignored, "but," he assured those present, "now you've got your chance." "Yes we have, and we mean to use it—will the Liberal Government give women the vote?" The reply was as prompt and sharp as a pistol

shot. It was a woman's voice, and there was a woman standing up with a little white banner in her hands. There was a moment's breathless waiting for the speaker's answer, and then the usual uproar burst forth. The man who "knew" Miss Pankhurst was the first to snatch the banner from this woman, but it was evident that many sitting all around her were unknown friends.

For some considerable time it was impossible to proceed with the meeting, because whilst the noise was at its height the interrupter sat down and waited, but as soon as it had subsided and Mr. Churchill attempted to continue his speech she again got up and pressed for an answer to her question. Time after time this happened. The chairman tried to get Mr. Churchill to give an answer, but he refused. The stewards wanted to throw the woman out, but many men were prepared to fight for her and they were afraid.

At last the chairman said that if the lady would promise to be quiet, afterwards she should speak from the platform for five minutes. To this she was not disposed to agree, but went up to the platform to explain that all she wanted was an answer to her question.

Speaking directly to Mr. Winston Churchill, she said: "Don't you understand what it is I want?" but he answered angrily, "Get away, I won't have anything to do with you!"

"You'd better come up on the platform," the chairman said, "we can hear you then—as it is, half the people in the meeting don't know what it's all about." She consented, and for the next five minutes tried to make her explanation, but the enthusiastic Liberals in the first three front rows stood up and yelled continuously in the effort to drown every word.

When the five minutes were over the woman turned to go, but Mr. Churchill seized her by the arm, and forced her to sit down in a chair at the back of the platform, saying, "No, you must wait here till you have heard what I have got to say." Then, turning to the audience, he told them that, having regard to the treatment he had received and to the destruction of great public meetings he had witnessed by the advocates of women's suffrage, nothing would induce him to vote for giving women the franchise. As he finished his sentence everyone on the platform rose, and the woman questioner with the rest. "I want to go now," she said, and instantly two men seized her, hurried her to the side of the platform, and swung her roughly over the edge. Then she was taken hold of by two others, and, screened from the rest of the meeting by a group of men, she was dragged into an ante-room.

One of the men now left to find a key, and the other remained alone with her in the room, standing with his back to the door. He at once began to use the most violent language, and, calling her a "cat," gesticulated as though he would scratch her face with his hands.

Knowing that the room was on the ground floor she ran to the window and threw it open, but it was barred. Some people were, however, passing in the side street, and she called to them saying, "I want you to be witnesses of anything that takes place in this room." The people at once came running up, and shouted to the man to behave himself. He subsided, and when presently the key was brought to him he locked the door and went away.

Now, some of those outside in the street discovered that one of the windows had no bars, and they called to the prisoner to come and open it in order that they might help her to escape. This was easily done, and an indignation meeting was immediately held on a piece of waste ground near by.

Meanwhile, Mr. Churchill was going on to his other meetings, but he found a woman ready to question him at every one, and this sort of thing continued day after day. The inhabitants of that district became largely converted to the women's point of view, and in some cases after violent scenes of disorder the entire audience got up and left the meeting when they found that Mr. Churchill was not prepared to give a straightforward answer to the women's question. Though in the result Mr. Winston Churchill won the election, his majority was smaller than that of any of the other Manchester Liberal candidates.

(To be continued.)

THE PRISONERS AT BOW STREET.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE AND MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE IN THE WITNESS BOX.

The adjourned hearing of the charge against Mrs. Pankhurst, Miss Christabel Pankhurst, and Mrs. Drummond was taken at Bow-street on Wednesday morning.

On Mr. Curtis Bennett, the magistrate, taking his seat,

Mr. Muskett said the case for the prosecution was concluded last week.

The magistrate, addressing the defendants, said: I would just make one suggestion. It may be for the benefit of two gentlemen who are here, that before you make any remarks their evidence should be taken, because they have, I know, important engagements elsewhere.

Miss Pankhurst: I desire first to submit that, as a matter of law, you ought not to bind us over at all, having regard to the form of the summonses and the nature of the evidence that has been adduced by the prosecution in support of them.

The Magistrate: Won't you submit that afterwards?

Miss Pankhurst: I think with your permission it might be well to submit it now.

The Magistrate: I am only suggesting that you should call these two gentlemen first.

Miss Pankhurst: Do I understand that if I take their evidence now it will be open for me to raise this later?

The Magistrate: Certainly.

Mr. Lloyd George.

Mr. Lloyd-George then went into the witness-box.

Miss Pankhurst: You are Mr. Lloyd-George?—Yes.

Privy-Councillor and Chancellor of the Exchequer?—Yes.

Were you present at the meeting addressed by Mrs. Pankhurst, Mrs. Drummond, and myself in Trafalgar-square on October 11?

—I think I was there for about ten minutes. I believe I heard Mrs. Pankhurst—partly.

Did you see a copy of the bills which were being distributed to members of the audience?—Yes. A young lady gave it to me the moment I arrived—it invited me to rush the House of Commons.

How did you interpret the invitation conveyed to you as a member of the audience? What did you think we wanted you to do?—I really should not like to place an interpretation upon the document. I don't think it is quite my function.

Well, I am speaking to you as a member of the general public.—I heard what Mrs. Pankhurst said, and I thought she placed the interpretation you desired to be put upon the document.

I want to deal with the matter in this way. First of all to get the meaning conveyed by the bill, quite apart from anything you may have heard said; and then we must throw some light upon the meaning of the bill by examining the words which were spoken on the platform. Let us take the bill itself. Imagine you were not at the meeting at all, but were walking up the Strand, and someone gave you a copy of this bill and you read it—"Help the Suffragettes to rush the House of Commons." And suppose you forgot you were a member of the Government and regarded yourself just as an ordinary person like myself—quite unofficial. You get this bill. What would you think you were called upon to do?—Really, I should not like to be called upon to undertake so difficult a task as to interpret that document.

Now, this word "rush," which seems to be at the bottom of it all. What does it mean?—I understood the invitation from Mrs. Pankhurst was to force an entrance to the House of Commons.

No, no. I want you to keep your mind centred on the bill. Let us forget what Mrs. Pankhurst said. What did the bill say?—I really forgot what the bill said.

I can refresh your memory. The bill said, "Help the Suffragettes to rush the House of Commons."—Yes; that's it.

I want you to define the word "rush"?—I cannot undertake to do that.

You can't offer any definition of the word "rush"?—No, I cannot.

Well, I will suggest some to you. I find that in Chambers' English Dictionary one of the meanings of the word is an "eager demand." Now what do you think of that?—I can't enter into competition with Chambers' Dictionary. I am prepared to accept it.

"Urgent pressure of business." That is another meaning. Ogilvie gives the same meaning—"eager demand." Now, if you were asked to help the Suffragettes to make an eager demand to the House of Commons that they should give votes to women, would you feel we were calling upon you to do an illegal act?—That is not for me to say.

The Magistrate: The witness is perfectly right. That is for me to say on the evidence. I have not interfered so far.

Miss Pankhurst: Here is another sense in which the word "rush" is used, and I think it will be of some interest to you.

We use it in this connection—to rush bills through Parliament.

Witness: Yes, I think I have some experience of that.

Miss Pankhurst: "On the rush," we are told in another dictionary, means in a hurry. There is nothing unlawful in being in a hurry.

The Magistrate: I have already said you must address those remarks to me afterwards.

Miss Pankhurst: Did you understand we asked you to go in a hurry to the House of Commons to make this eager demand for enfranchisement? Was that the meaning which the bill conveyed to you?—I cannot express any opinion as to that. I can only give evidence as to what I really saw.

You can't tell me what you, as a member of the public, understood?

The Magistrate: Miss Pankhurst, you must take my ruling, please.

Miss Pankhurst (to witness): Can you tell me at all what were the words you heard Mrs. Pankhurst use in Trafalgar-square?—I really could not. If you insist upon my giving my vague recollection I shall do so.

I should like to have it.—My vague recollection is that Mrs. Pankhurst insisted upon the right of women to have access to the House of Commons, and she said if that was refused they meant to force an entrance, and she invited the crowd to assist her. I am only giving a vague impression of the words that were used.

Did you hear this: "On Tuesday evening, at Caxton Hall, we shall ask those who support the women to come to Parliament-square. There will be a deputation of women, who have no rights in the House of Commons such as men have. The Government does not know its own mind, it changes so; but we know we want the vote and mean to have it"?—Yes; I was there when Mrs. Pankhurst said that.

She was the only speaker you heard?—Yes.

Now, what impression did you form from the demeanour of the crowd in Trafalgar-square as to whether they were likely to respond to this invitation to rush the House of Commons?—I thought they were a very unlikely crowd to respond.

You didn't think they would come?—Not from the demeanour of the crowd—certainly not.

You thought that although we issued the invitation it would not be accepted?—Not by that particular crowd.

Did you think on other grounds that there would be a large public response to this invitation?—That I should not like to say.

Did you hear the speaker threaten any violence to you or to any member of the Government?—Oh, no.

She didn't invite others to attack you in any way?—Oh, no.

She didn't urge the people to come armed?—Oh, no; I never heard anything of that sort.

There was no suggestion that public or private property should be in any way damaged?—Oh, I do not suggest anything of that sort.

You heard nothing of that kind?—No.

What did you anticipate that the consequence would be to you yourself personally if the public responded to the invitation to rush the House of Commons?—Well, I didn't think it was very formidable.

You didn't think you would be hurt?—(The witness smiled and shook his head.)

Or that any of your colleagues would be hurt?—Oh, there was no suggestion of any personal violence to anybody.

No suggestion of violence at all. Then you are able to tell me that the speeches were not inflammatory. They were not likely to incite to violence?—I should not like to express an opinion as to what the result would be of inviting a crowd of people to force an entrance to the House of Commons. I should not have thought it possible to do that without some violence.

You didn't hear any violence advocated?—Except to force an entrance to the House of Commons.

You didn't hear the word "force"?—I have only a very vague impression as to the words used. If Mrs. Pankhurst says she didn't use the word force I would not contradict her.

There were no words so likely to incite to violence as the advice you gave at Swansea, that women should be ruthlessly flung out of your meeting?

Mr. Muskett: That is quite irrelevant.

The Magistrate: That was a private meeting, and not of the same character.

Miss Pankhurst: A public meeting.

The Magistrate: Well, it is private in a sense.

Miss Pankhurst: They are private nowadays. That is quite true. (To witness): You didn't hear any speeches made by myself or by Mrs. Drummond?

The Magistrate: The witness has already said he only heard Mrs. Pankhurst.

The Witness: I only heard Mrs. Pankhurst for about ten minutes or a quarter of an hour.

Am I right in assuming that you read the official organ of our society?—Well, I only read, I think, one copy that was kindly sent me by Mrs. Pethick Lawrence.

Your didn't read the copy in which Mrs. Pankhurst issued a manifesto dealing with the plans for the 13th?—No; I don't think it was included in that.

Listening to the speeches in Trafalgar-square, what did you gather as to the object we had in view in planning a rush to the House of Commons?—I was not quite clear.

You were not quite clear as to the object?—No, except to force an entrance to the House of Commons; that is all I heard.

Did you gather for what reason this rush had been planned?

The Magistrate: You are not entitled to cross-examine your own witness. I am loth to stop you. I should have stopped counsel before this.

Miss Pankhurst: I rather anticipated this difficulty, and I looked up "Taylor on Evidence," and I saw words which I thought gave me a good deal of latitude. (To witness): Were you in the neighbourhood of the House of Commons on the evening of the 13th?—I was in the House of Commons.

Before you reached the House of Commons you were necessarily in the street, and you saw something of what took place?—Yes, I saw a little bit.

You were not alone, I think?—No, I had my little girl with me.

How old is she?—She is six.

Did you think it safe to bring her out?—Certainly. She was very amused.

You thought it was quite safe for a child of those tender years to be amongst the crowd?—I was not amongst the crowd.

You thought that, in spite of the contemplated rush, you were safe to have her inside and outside the House of Commons?—Yes, considering the police arrangements.

Were the streets crowded?—Not by the House. You see I only brought her from Downing-street to the House, and I think that was clear.

Were you in the crowd itself?—No; it was quite clear.

Did you see any women you supposed to be members of our Union?—I don't think I did.

Did you see any women arrested?—I was not anywhere near that.

Had you any opportunity of noticing the attitude of the crowd?—I don't think there was much of a crowd by the House of Commons. I think it was on the Embankment; so I heard.

Had you any opportunity of seeing any arrests or what was going on in the crowded part?—No, I did not see the crowd at all.

Were you yourself attacked or assaulted in any way?—Oh! dear me, no.

Did you apprehend any attack or assault?—No.

Can you tell me, according to your own knowledge, what harm has resulted from the events of the 13th?—I don't think I can tell you that.

You can't tell me?—No.

Do you know of any serious injury having taken place?—I should not like to express any opinion. It is hardly my function in the witness-box.

The prosecution asserts that a serious breach of the peace took place. Do you concur with that statement?

The Magistrate: The Chancellor of the Exchequer would have nothing to do with that.

Miss Pankhurst: I believe you are a lawyer?—Well, I hope I am.

Don't you think the offence alleged against us would be more properly described as unlawful assembly?—There again, I was not put in the witness-box to express an opinion of that sort.

The Magistrate: That has nothing to do with Mr. Lloyd George.

Miss Pankhurst: Of course, I am subject to your guidance, your worship. (To witness): You have seen the form of summons issued against us?—No.

You don't know with what we are charged?—No, I don't really.

The Magistrate: Have you any other question?

Miss Pankhurst: Well, I think it is desirable he should know. But I am subject to your guidance.

Witness: I have nothing to do with it.

Miss Pankhurst: You know we are asked to show cause why we should not be bound over for having incited people to commit an unlawful act?—I take it from you, Miss Pankhurst, but I don't know.

Miss Pankhurst: Yet the result of the summons being in this form is that we are denied the right of trial by jury.

The Magistrate: The witness has nothing to do with that. That is the law of the land.

Miss Pankhurst: Does it occur to you that the authorities, in

choosing this form of procedure against us, deliberately wished to deprive us of the right to trial by jury?

The Magistrate: That, again, is not a question for the witness.

Miss Pankhurst: May I put the question if you think it a very serious thing—this proposal to rush the House of Commons?

Witness: Oh, yes. I should have thought you would have thought that too, Miss Pankhurst.

Still, it is in the nature of a political offence?—Well, I should not like to say anything about that. In fact, I am simply here as a witness to give evidence of what I saw. I really cannot go into the political aspect of the matter.

You are aware that we argue that, as we are deprived of a share in the election of Parliamentary representatives we are entitled to go in person to the House of Commons?—That was a point put by Mrs. Pankhurst.

Do you agree with that point of view?—I should not like to express an opinion.

The Magistrate: It is not for the witness to express an opinion.

Miss Pankhurst: I should like to put this question, Do you think that coercion is the right way of dealing with political disturbers?

The Magistrate: That, again, is not for the witness.

Miss Pankhurst: You refuse to answer?

Witness: I don't refuse to answer, but I must obey the decision of the Bench that I cannot express an opinion about things in the witness-box.

Miss Pankhurst: Am I to understand that an answer must not be given to that?

The Magistrate: No.

Miss Pankhurst: Not even if the witness would like to do so?

The Magistrate: No.

Miss Pankhurst: Well, is it likely to be a successful way of dealing with political disturbances?

The Magistrate: That, again, is not admissible.

Miss Pankhurst: But for these restrictions, your worship . . . ! (To witness): Can you tell me whether any interference with public order took place in connection with previous movements for franchise reform?—I should have thought that was an historical fact.

Have you yourself taken part in any such movement? Does your mind go back to 1884?

The Magistrate: That is cross-examination. Your witness cannot go into that.

Miss Pankhurst: In a sense, he is my witness.

The Magistrate: In every sense at present.

Mr. Lloyd George's Encouragement.

Miss Pankhurst: Have we not received encouragement from you, or, if not from you, from your colleagues, to take action of this kind?

Witness: I should be very much surprised to hear that.

You would be surprised to hear that?—Very.

You deny that we have been encouraged by Liberal statesmen to take action of this kind?—I simply express astonishment at the statement.

Miss Pankhurst: Have you ever heard these words spoken by us at Trafalgar-square or by any Liberal statesman? "I am sorry to say that if no instructions had ever been addressed in political crises to the people of this country, except to remember to hate violence and love order and exercise patience, the liberties of this country would never have been attained"—have you heard these words before?—I cannot call them to mind.

Miss Pankhurst: These were the words of William Ewart Gladstone.—I accept your statement.

Miss Pankhurst: Is not that encouragement to such action as we have taken?—You ask me a question of opinion again. I am not competent to express an opinion in the witness-box.

Were you present in the House of Commons when Mr. Herbert Gladstone gave advice to the women of this movement, while addressing the House on women's suffrage?—No.

Miss Pankhurst: You were not present.—When was it?

In this present Parliament?—I don't remember.

You don't know, then, that he encouraged us to action of this kind?

The Magistrate: He says he doesn't remember.

Witness: I don't think I heard him on the subject. I was probably attending to the duties of my department.

Miss Pankhurst: Is it not a fact that you yourself have set an example of revolt?

The Magistrate: You need not answer that question.

Miss Pankhurst: Well, your worship, my point of view was—

The Magistrate: You must not attack your own witness.

Miss Pankhurst: My point of view was that, when it comes to the moment when you make your decision, you will inquire a little into the motive.

The Magistrate: Yes, but you must not attack your own witness.

Mr. Lloyd George: I certainly never incited a crowd to violence.

Miss Pankhurst: Not in the Welsh graveyard case?—No.

You did not tell them to break down the wall and disinter a body?—I gave advice which was found by the Court of Appeal to be sound legal advice.

Miss Pankhurst: We think we are giving sound legal advice too. Are you aware that in planning the action of the 13th we were carrying out literally the advice given by Liberal statesmen?—Oh, I could not tell you.

You don't know that John Bright advised the people to take a precisely similar course?—No.

Are you aware that Mr. Chamberlain in 1884 threatened precisely the same action?—I did not know.

You don't know that he threatened to march 100,000 men on London?

The Magistrate: He has answered the question—he never heard of it.

Miss Pankhurst: Do you know what action was taken against him by the Liberal Government?—Was he prosecuted?

Witness: Miss Pankhurst, I have already said that I do not remember the incident you refer to.

You might remember Mr. Chamberlain being in the dock?—I don't know.

You don't know what action the House of Commons took? Your mind is a blank upon the subject?—Since you put it to me, I don't believe Mr. Chamberlain ever threatened to use violence and break the law.

I must refer you to the pages of Hansard.—Certainly.

Do you know what advice another eminent statesman gave? Do you know that Lord Randolph Churchill urged the men of Ulster to fight, and said they would be right? He advised them to use the arbitrament of force?—Yes.

Did he ever stand in the dock? Was he prosecuted? Yet are you not of opinion that he incited to violence more than we have done?—Well, I think I have already told you, Miss Pankhurst, I cannot express opinions here in the witness-box.

Miss Pankhurst again quoted from "Taylor on Evidence," as to the discretion of the magistrate in allowing questions to be put to a witness who obviously appeared to be hostile or interested for the other party.

The Magistrate: I have seen neither one nor the other.

Miss Pankhurst: Or unwilling to give evidence.

The Magistrate: I think the witness is giving his evidence most fairly.

Miss Pankhurst: I think I need not trouble him with any further questions.

Questions by Mrs. Pankhurst.

Mrs. Pankhurst: I should like to ask Mr. Lloyd George one further question about his being present with his little girl. You remember you told my daughter that you anticipated no danger for your little girl, and that you were rather amused?

Mr. Lloyd George: I said the little girl was amused.

You took her out to be amused by the sight of the crowd?—She wanted to see the crowd, and I took her out.

Don't you think that from that fact we might gather that probably if it had been less possible for your little girl to go out to be amused that the people with whom you are associated would have taken the thing a great deal more seriously? That the very self-restraint which allowed your little daughter to go out and be amused—I am not sure as to the question you are putting, but I think you are asking me for an opinion again. I am here to give evidence as to facts.

I want to ask you a question about what you heard me say on Sunday. Did I ask the crowd to help the women get into the House of Commons because it was the people's House of Commons; women formed part of the people, and they had as much right to be represented there as men?—Yes, that seemed to be the argument.

Then perhaps you remember I said that since women were not in the position of men, and could not send representatives to press their claim on the Government, they had a constitutional right to go there themselves?—Now that you remind me, I remember you saying that.

And that they were unlawfully shut out from the House of Commons?—Yes, that was the argument.

Mrs. Pankhurst: Now, I put it to you; Mr. Lloyd George, to show cause why we should not be bound over.

Mr. Lloyd George: Well, you have asked me to come here and go into the witness-box to say what I have seen, that is all.

The Magistrate: Yes, that is the only thing a witness can do.

Mrs. Pankhurst: I want to ask you whether we can ask Mr. Lloyd George some questions—

The Magistrate: You have asked him a great many.

Mrs. Pankhurst (to the magistrate): Questions which would show you cause why we should not be bound over?

The Magistrate: No, that is for me.

Mrs. Pankhurst: My point is that the evidence he would give would assist you.

The Magistrate: Well, the evidence he has given will assist me.

Mrs. Pankhurst: But we want him to give more. I want to ask him some further questions about what he and other Liberal statesmen have advised people to do.

The Magistrate: We have had a great deal of that from your daughter. Do you wish to have it again?

Mrs. Pankhurst: I want to ask you whether, in your opinion, the whole of this agitation which women are carrying on, very much against the grain, would not be immediately stopped if women got their constitutional rights conceded to them?—I should think that is very likely.

I want to ask you whether, in your opinion, the women who are in the dock here to-day are women who are ordinary law-breakers, or who would have occasion to come into this Court for any other than political reasons?—No, of course not.

Questions by Mrs. Drummond.

Mrs. Drummond: When you received the bill in Trafalgar-square, did you say anything to the lady who gave it to you?—No; I took it from her.

Did you not consider it would rather be your duty to draw attention to the bill to the lady who gave it to you?—It is not my business. Certainly not.

Mrs. Drummond: Well, I am asking you as a responsible member of the public.—Well, the Commissioner of Police would be the person to attend to that.

Mrs. Drummond: Did you draw the attention of the police to the bill?—No.

Mrs. Drummond: I should like to ask Mr. Lloyd George this question. Many times he has refused to answer me. When do you intend to put a stop to these things by giving us the vote?

The Magistrate: That is not a question.

Mrs. Drummond: Perhaps he cannot answer me; but there is one thing, he cannot run away. You refuse to answer?

The Magistrate: You cannot ask it.

Mrs. Drummond: You and your colleagues are more to blame for this agitation.

The Magistrate: You must not make a statement.

Mrs. Drummond: You see, we ladies don't get a chance.

Mr. Lloyd George (smiling): Indeed, you do.

Mr. Muskett did not cross-examine the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Miss Brackenbury and Mr. Horace Smith.

Mr. Curtis Bennett at this point wished Miss Pankhurst to call Mr. Herbert Gladstone, but Miss Pankhurst asked leave to call one other witness first. The magistrate demurred, and Miss Pankhurst said: "I have only one question to put to this lady."

The Magistrate: Very well, then, one question.

Miss Marie Brackenbury, in reply to Miss Pankhurst, said she had suffered six weeks' imprisonment in connection with the votes for women agitation.

Miss Pankhurst: Did Mr. Horace Smith tell you that in sentencing you to that term he was doing what he was told?

"You must not put that question," said the magistrate; but the witness had already replied, "He did."

Mrs. Pankhurst: The witness has said "Yes" upon oath.

Mr. Gladstone's Evidence.

Mr. Herbert Gladstone, the Home Secretary, was next called, and questioned by Miss Pankhurst.

By virtue of your office as Home Secretary, have you not immediate control over the Metropolitan police?—No, not exactly immediate control.

Then who has immediate control?—The Commissioner.

And he is responsible to you?—To me.

You also appoint the police-magistrates in the metropolis, and the regulation of the business of their courts is entirely in your hands?

The Magistrate: You must not go into questions of State, you know. That is clearly laid down.

Miss Pankhurst: You are, therefore, ultimately responsible for the proceedings which have been taken against us?—The responsible department.

Did you not, as a matter of fact, instruct the Commissioner of Police to take the present proceedings?

Mr. Muskett: I object to that.

The Magistrate: That question cannot be answered.

Miss Pankhurst: Are the Government as a whole responsible for these proceedings?

Mr. Muskett: I object to that.

The Magistrate: That, again, you cannot put.

Miss Pankhurst: Did you instruct Mr. Horace Smith to decide against Miss Brackenbury and give her six weeks?

The Magistrate: You cannot put that question either.

Miss Pankhurst: It is a pity that the public interest should suffer on that account. To Witness: Did you ever give any instructions to Mr. Horace Smith?

Mr. Muskett: I object to this. It is contempt of Court to continue putting these questions.

Miss Pankhurst: The public will answer them. To Witness: What do you suggest is the meaning of what Mr. Horace Smith has said?

The Magistrate: The same ruling applies. This witness is here to answer any question you have got to ask him about what he saw when he was in Parliament-street on the day in question.

Miss Pankhurst: Is this question permissible? Did you see a copy of the bill issued by us inviting the public to the House of Commons?—I have seen it.

The Magistrate: If it was shown to you in your official capacity it is not admissible.

Witness: I am under your ruling, sir.

Miss Pankhurst: Was it given to you as an ordinary member of the public in the street?—No, certainly not.

Can you define the word "rush"? What impression has it made on your mind?—I can hardly give any definition of it, but a rush implies force.

Do you deny that it implies speed rather than force?—Speed generally involves force.

Miss Pankhurst: Suppose I am standing near the door of the House, and I run up the steps—I have rushed the House of Commons?—Yes, but I should say you must exert a considerable amount of force to do that.

Energy, perhaps, but I should not offer any force to anybody or anything?—I hope not.

I suggest that it is possible to rush the House without attacking anybody or hurting anybody?—If you ask me that, I don't think it is possible.

Miss Pankhurst: Not according to present regulations, perhaps. There are so many people in one's way. We did not know what amount of force would be directed against us.

Mr. Muskett: Put questions, please.

Miss Pankhurst: I think it is important we should ascertain how this is understood.

The Magistrate: He has told you he thought it meant force. You must take the answer.

Miss Pankhurst: Were you anticipating you would be in bodily danger as a consequence of the issue of this bill?—I didn't think of it at all. I didn't think whether the possibility existed or not.

You are like us. You are above those considerations. You were not in fear?—No, not at all.

Did you think public property was in danger as a consequence of this bill having been issued?—Do you mean on the 13th?

Yes, as a consequence of this bill.—I thought it was quite possible.

You thought the public would be violent?—I thought there would be danger from the crowds.

Then you were agreeably disappointed on the morning of the 14th, when you found no harm had been done?—No, I was not. The police measures were sufficient to stop any serious accident or danger.

You were in the street on the 13th?—Yes.

Did you see the public make any attack on anybody? Do you think that, but for the action of the police, they would have assaulted you?—I was in the street for a very short time.

During the time did you form the impression that, but for the protection of the police, your life would have been in danger?—Not my life. Certainly the situation required very strong and careful action by the police.

You were in the street on the 13th. Did you see the public make any attack on anybody?—I was only in the street for a short while. Certainly the situation required very strong and careful action by the police.

Miss Pankhurst: Do you assert that the crowd showed a hostile spirit?—I was only in one or two places.

But you can speak for that portion of the crowd that you did see?—I saw a certain crowd at six o'clock when I went out.

Was their demeanour violent or hostile? Did you feel that but for the line of police protecting you they would have rushed upon you and attacked you?—The police were not protecting me.

Had it not been for the presence of the police, do you think you would have been attacked by the crowd?—I don't know what object the crowd would have in attacking me. I didn't consider it.

You didn't feel in fear?—I felt no personal fear.

Did any other person seem in danger of attack?—The police gave them very little chance.

What made you think them a dangerous or hostile crowd?—Of course, I am quite accustomed to seeing these crowds, and I know what has happened before.

What has happened?—Disorderly scenes.

You mean in connection with our demonstrations?—It is not for me to connect disorder with your demonstrations. I am referring to crowds which have assembled during the last two years.

What harm have they done?—Very little, as it happened.

What harm have they attempted to do?—That is not for me to answer.

Have they attempted to do more than secure an interview with the Prime Minister?

The Magistrate: That is not a question for him to answer.

We will get back to the 13th. Do you think anyone was obstructed in their passage to the House?—I cannot speak for other people.

You saw no attempt to waylay members or Ministers?

The Magistrate: He hasn't said he did. You must not cross-examine your own witness.

Miss Pankhurst: Well, but for the presence of the police do you think you would have been attacked by the crowd?—I do not know what object the crowd would have had in attacking me.

Did you see the crowd do any harm whatever?—I did not.

Now you saw a portion of the crowd. Did you see them attack property?—No, certainly not.

Did you see them attack any person?—Not where I was.

Did you see them do any harm whatsoever?—No, I did not.

What were these people doing?—There was a great crowd.

But a great crowd assembles when the King goes to open Parliament.—Presumably they were waiting to rush the House of Commons.

Did you see any women whom you identified as Suffragists?—I didn't see many women.

Did you see any women wearing our colours, purple, white, and green?—I did not notice any.

Did you see any arrests?—I saw no arrests.

Did you see anyone injured?—No.

Did you hear of anyone being injured?—I have seen it stated that certain police-constables were injured.

You did not hear that ten people were received in hospital, but discharged?—I know nothing about that.

Will you tell me what harm has resulted from what took place?—All I can say is that there were thirty-seven arrests and over forty complaints of losses of purses and watches.

Comparing that with the net result of a Lord Mayor's Show crowd, or any sort of procession, really less harm resulted?—I could not say that.

I suppose I may not ask how many policemen were on duty?

The Magistrate: I don't suppose the Home Secretary knows that.

Miss Pankhurst: I suppose I may not ask these questions either. This would have been more suitable to the other witness (Mr. Lloyd George). What has been the cost to the country?

The Magistrate: We cannot go into these questions.

Will you tell me why we were not charged with unlawful assembly?—I cannot tell you.

You know the consequence to be that we are deprived of trial by jury?—You tell me. I am not acquainted with the particular part of the law you are referring to.

If I say that the reason is that the Government are afraid to send us to a jury... (Continuing) What have you to say with regard to our contention that the offence with which we are charged is a political offence?

The Magistrate: You must not put that question.

How do you define political offence?—I wish you would give me a good definition. I am often asked that question in the House of Commons.

Well, with the Magistrate's permission, I will. A political offence is one committed in connection with political disturbances and with a political motive.—I don't think that a sufficient explanation.

If I am at liberty after this day's proceedings are over, I shall have pleasure in sending you a fuller account. Do you recollect that when a deputation of women went to the House of Commons, instead of being allowed to enter they were arrested?—I have no immediate knowledge of that. I have a general recollection.

Do you remember that when a deputation went to the House of Commons to see the Prime Minister instead of being allowed to enter they were arrested?

The Magistrate: That does not arise on the issue.

Miss Pankhurst: It throws a little light on it.

The Magistrate: Please do obey, otherwise I shall have to stop it altogether. I have given you much more licence than I should give counsel.

Miss Pankhurst: In the action we took on the 13th, is it within your knowledge that in taking that action we were acting on advice given by yourself?—I wish you would take my advice.

We are trying to take it. What did you mean when you said men had used *force majeure* in demanding the vote?—If you hand me the speech I daresay I can tell you.

I have a copy of the speech.

The Magistrate: How is this material as to what Mr. Gladstone

saw. You are cross-examining your own witness, Miss Pankhurst, and you must not do that.

Miss Pankhurst: May I not ask any explanation whatever as to the counsel given to us?

The Magistrate: No, you may not.

Miss Pankhurst: We never have any other opportunity. May I ask whether he made certain statements. Did you say it was impossible not to sympathise with the eagerness and passion which have actuated so many women on this subject?—Yes.

Did you say you were entirely in favour of the principle of woman's suffrage?—Yes.

Did you say men had had to struggle for centuries for their political rights?—Yes.

Did you say that they had to fight from the time of Cromwell, and for the last 130 years the warfare had been perpetual?—Yes.

Did you say that on this question experience showed that predominance of argument alone was not enough to win the political day?—Yes.

Did you say that on this question experience showed that predominance of argument alone—and you believed that had been attained—was not enough to win the political day. Did you say that?—Yes.

Predominance of argument alone will not win the political day. Did you say that we are in the stage of what is called "academic discussion," which serves for ventilation of pious opinions, and is accompanied, you admit, by no effective action on the part of the Government, or of political parties, or of voters throughout the country?—Yes.

Did you say that members of the House of Commons reflect the opinion of the country, not only in regard to the number of people outside, but in regard to the intensity of the feeling in support of a movement, and that the Government must necessarily be a reflex of the party which brought it into being?—Yes.

Did you say this? "There comes a time when political dynamics are far more important than political arguments." You said that?—Yes.

And that "Men had learned this lesson"?—Yes.

And that they know the necessity for demonstrating that *force majeure* which actuates and arms a Government for effective work?—Yes. I think it a most excellent speech." (Laughter.)

I agree with you. Did you say that that was the task before the supporters of this great movement?—Yes.

Did you speak of people assembling in tens of thousands in the 'thirties, 'sixties, and 'eighties, and do you know that we have done it on Woodhouse Moor and in Hyde Park?—Yes.

Miss Pankhurst: Why don't you give us the vote then? (Laughter.) Are you aware of the words your distinguished father spoke on the matter?—I heard the quotation.

Do you assent to the proposition he laid down?—Yes.

Then you cannot condemn our methods any more?—That is hardly a matter for my opinion.

Miss Pankhurst: It is a very interesting question, though. I think I need not trouble you further.

Questions by Mrs. Pankhurst.

Mrs. Pankhurst: I want to ask Mr. Gladstone if he is aware that the consequence of our being ordered to be bound over is that we cannot consent and we shall go to prison?

The Magistrate: That is a matter of law, not for the witness.

Mrs. Pankhurst: If that happens to us, if we go to prison, I hope Mr. Gladstone will see that we go as political prisoners.

The Magistrate: That you must not ask.

Mrs. Pankhurst: But may I ask Mr. Gladstone this—if he is aware that in the City-square in Leeds on last Friday night 10,000 people, at six hours' notice, assembled, and carried, with two dissentients, a resolution calling upon the Government to pass Mr. Stanger's Bill during this session?

Mr. Muskett: That is not a question for Mr. Gladstone.

Mrs. Pankhurst: Well, Mr. Gladstone has answered some other political questions, sir.

(Continuing) I should like to ask Mr. Gladstone whether he recognises this morning that this is a political agitation?—I suppose it is a political agitation to get the franchise for women.

Do you think we should be likely to break the criminal law if we had the same means of representation as men?—I am sure your motive is excellent. It is a hypothetical question which I cannot answer.

Mrs. Pankhurst: I will ask Mr. Gladstone whether in his opinion he thinks we should be treated as ordinary criminals—searched, stripped, and put into the cells, as though we were drunkards or pickpockets?

The Magistrate: You must not put that question.

This concluded Mr. Gladstone's evidence, and as he and Mr. Lloyd-George were about to leave the court Miss Pankhurst said: May we tender our warm thanks to these two gentlemen who have done us the favour of coming forward as witnesses?

Miss Pankhurst proceeded to quote numerous authorities in support of her contention that the charge should have been one of unlawful assembly, and that the magistrate had no power to bind the defendants over.

Mr. Curtis Bennett said he would give his decision later.

A Succession of Witnesses.

Further evidence was then called.

Coloney Percy H. H. Massy stated that he was in Victoria-street on the evening of October 13, and in his opinion the crowd was perfectly orderly. He saw nobody attacked or injured.

Lady Constance Lytton said she considered the crowd was remarkably well-behaved and respectable.

Miss Annie Moor stated that she had been more roughly treated at society weddings than she was in this crowd. She was in the crowd on the occasion of Mr. Winston Churchill's marriage, and was much more jostled than on the evening of the 13th.

Mr. Henry Wood Nevinston and Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson both agreed that the crowds sympathised with the suffragists, and that there was no disorder.

In cross-examination, Dr. Anderson, after some hesitation, said she approved of the Bill containing the invitation to "rush" the House.

Mrs. May, replying to Mr. Muskett, said she worked as actively as possible for the cause, but she did not speak or organise.

Spiritual Force.

Miss Sylvia Pankhurst said the suffragists' instructions were to meet physical force with spiritual force.

After the luncheon adjournment several witnesses testified that there was never any intention to make use of violence, and that the demeanour of the crowds which collected was perfectly orderly. It was also frequently stated that the people appeared to sympathise with the women more than they had done upon any previous occasion.

Miss Evelyn Sharp, the well-known writer, said she regarded the bill as an invitation to go to the House of Commons, and not to turn back if possible. Witness herself "doubled," and got past the biggest policeman she ever saw. She was, however, afterwards caught by an inspector, and sent back. It was like a rush at hockey.

Albert Rettick said he looked upon the bill as an invitation to the public to support the women in going to the House, and possibly to see fair play.

Miss Florence Elizabeth Macaulay gave historical instances of women going to the House of Commons for the purpose of presenting petitions.

Miss Pankhurst: It appears that we were within our constitutional rights in going to the House?

Witness: I have been a student of history for many years, and I think you were only reviving an ancient custom.

Mrs. Celia M. McKenzie thought the commonsense of Mr. Asquith would have caused him to receive a deputation of 13 quiet ladies.

Sidney Dillon Shallard, a journalist, said the police made a desert of about a quarter of a mile round the House of Commons. Miss Pankhurst: They made a desert, and called it peace.

At a quarter-past seven the magistrate asked how many more witnesses there were for the defence.

Miss Pankhurst: About 50. We are sorry to take up the time of the Court, but we are fighting for our liberty.

The hearing was then adjourned until Saturday, the defendants being released on the same bail as before.

Upon the three ladies being brought into Court, on Saturday, October 24, the magistrate said: I have carefully considered what steps should be taken by me to prevent the conduct of this case being so continued as to become a serious obstacle in the administration of justice at this Court. I may at once state that simple repetition of the same class of evidence given by the last twenty-four witnesses will not affect my judgment, and therefore I must refuse to hear a continuation of that class of evidence. If you wish me to hear any particular person or persons on even the same lines of evidence as that already given I will consent now to hear them, but not more than two or three of such witnesses. If the defendants have evidence of a different nature which they wish me to hear I am quite willing to do so, provided it is limited to what is absolutely relevant to the matter before me, and is admissible in point of law. As this may take you a little by surprise I give you half an hour to consider what further evidence you may desire me to hear.

Miss Pankhurst: Would you kindly give us some definition of what evidence you think admissible?

The magistrate repeated that he was not going to take the same class of evidence as that of the witnesses he had already heard. He was willing to hear witnesses who could speak to a different state of facts, if their evidence was relevant.

Mrs. Pankhurst: Would you say what evidence you consider relevant?

The Magistrate: I cannot say more than I have done.

James Murray, M.P.

The case was then put back for a while. Upon resuming, Miss Pankhurst said the first witness they wished to call was Mr. James Murray, M.P. for East Aberdeen. That gentleman went into the witness-box, and was asked by Miss Pankhurst whether he was present at the Suffragists' meeting in Trafalgar-square on the 13th inst.

Witness: I was going into the National Gallery, and saw a congregation of well-dressed people in the square. I think your mother was speaking, but I could not hear anything. What struck me was that the crowd listening to her was composed of exactly the type of men and women who go to Church on Sunday in Scotland.

Miss Pankhurst: Then they must have been very respectable. Did you get a copy of the bill?—No.

I dare say you saw it in the papers?—I saw a statement in the paper.

How did you understand the word "rush"?—I didn't take the matter seriously at all.

The Magistrate: That really is for me, Miss Pankhurst, as I have told you.

Miss Pankhurst: Did you resolve to act on the invitation?—I could not very well, you see, because I was inside the citadel.

The Magistrate: He has the right of entry.

Miss Pankhurst: Were you near Westminster on the 13th?—I was in the House, and sitting down to dinner when I got a telegram sent from the neighbourhood of Bow-street from your mother, asking me to come across here.

The Magistrate: This cannot be relevant.

Witness: In coming here I drove in a hansom up Parliament-street. The whole place was like a besieged city, except that we had police-officers instead of soldiers. A little beyond Doyer House the crowd was held back by a cordon, but I had not the slightest difficulty in getting through in a hansom. Afterwards I returned to the House by the Strand and the Embankment, and had very little difficulty in getting back.

Miss Pankhurst: Was it a disorderly crowd?—No; I should think you could say an ordinary London crowd.

Mrs. Pankhurst: Did you come to the conclusion that the persons who had called the meeting desired to incite the crowd to disorder or damage?—No. I thought if it was for any purpose at all it was simply to advertise the cause.

Mrs. Pankhurst: You know something of the women who are conducting this agitation?

Witness: Yes; and I have the highest admiration for them for their earnestness of purpose, ability, and general management of the whole scheme. I don't say I approve of everything they do, but most of it I approve of.

You know they have tried every other political method?—Yes; and if they had been men instead of women they would not have been in the dock now, judging by the past.

Mrs. Pankhurst: Do you agree with Mr. Lloyd George when he said that if the Government would give us what we were asking for this agitation would cease—I have no doubt it would. I go further than Mr. Lloyd George, and say you are entitled to it.

Dr. Miller McGuire.

Dr. Miller McGuire stated that he was at the Trafalgar-square meeting, and heard nothing that anyone could object to. He spent most of the 13th looking at the "performance." There was nothing remotely approaching disorder of any kind.

Miss Agnes Murphy, of Hampstead, said the crowd in Victoria-street was the most orderly she had ever seen. She attributed this to the goodwill of the people towards the women, who had been ill-treated and grossly misrepresented in the Press.

The Magistrate: Those are three witnesses on exactly the same lines as the others.

Miss Pankhurst: We shall be delighted to follow other lines, with your permission.

The Magistrate: If you have any witnesses on different lines I will hear them.

Miss Pankhurst: I can call witnesses on different lines, but I don't know that the lines will be admissible. We can call witnesses to show that in taking this course we are taking the only possible course.

The Magistrate: That will not do.

Miss Pankhurst: We can call witnesses to show that we have been incited to this kind of action by our political opponents, the members of the Government.

The Magistrate: No; that you must not.

Miss Pankhurst: We can call witnesses to testify to our good character.

The Magistrate: That has not been raised in issue.

Miss Pankhurst: Then, if you will permit us to call no further evidence, I will proceed to address the Court.

The luncheon adjournment was then taken, and afterwards Miss Pankhurst stated that some fresh witnesses were forthcoming. One lady had travelled 50 miles to give evidence.

The Magistrate: Is it on the same lines?

Miss Pankhurst: I think that will appear when she is in the box.

The Magistrate: No; I will not hear it.

Miss Pankhurst: I have now to ask you to state a special case.

The Magistrate: Not at present.

Miss Pankhurst then applied for an adjournment, in order that she and her companions might be in a position to do themselves full justice when they addressed the Court.

The Magistrate: You have had a long time to take this matter into consideration. I think you must either address me now or not at all.

Miss Pankhurst: I can only do it under protest, and I want to point out that you are rushing this case through the Court. (Laughter.) You are not setting us at all a good example. I want again to insist upon our right to call further witnesses.

The Magistrate: I have decided that point once and for all. Are you going to address me or not?

The three prisoners then delivered their speeches from the dock. These speeches, which roused great feeling in the Court, are reported verbatim on pages 77-83.

At the close of the speeches, Mr. Muskett, in reply to the magistrate, said Mrs. Drummond had been convicted twice, and the other two defendants had each been dealt with once.

The Magistrate's Decision.

Mr. Curtis Bennett said there could be no doubt that it was for that court, and that court alone, to deal with the offence for which the defendants were in the first place summoned. The case of *Wise v. Dunning*, argued in the King's Bench Division on November 19 and 20, 1901, absolutely decided the point, to his mind, as to whether these proceedings were right or wrong. As to the facts, the defendants admitted that they were responsible for the distribution of this handbill, and although they were warned of the danger and difficulty which might arise in consequence of it, they persisted in going on. He had heard the very able speeches of the defendants, but he did not wish to make any further observations upon them, because it was not for him to discuss political matters. He was simply there for the purpose of endeavouring to carry out the law in order to preserve the peace and well-being of the metropolis, and there could be no question that that handbill, which was circulated, was by its contents liable to cause something to occur which might and probably would end in a breach of the peace. The Chief Commissioner of Police was bound to keep Parliament-square and the vicinity free and open, and he felt that it would be impossible to do that if crowds assembled together in order to help and see the women rush the House of Commons.

Between 5,000 and 6,000 police were required to keep order in consequence of this circular. Ten persons were taken to hospitals, seven policemen were placed on the sick-list, thirty-seven persons were charged at that court the following morning, and it was reported that no fewer than thirty watches were stolen. Could it for one instant be said that that circular asking the public to rush the House of Commons was not liable to create breaches of the peace? Therefore, as to the law there could be no question. To call a number of people to assemble together for that avowed object must bring the persons who called that meeting within the limits of this section, namely, they were doing something which was calculated to bring about a breach of the peace. Each of the two elder defendants would be bound over in their own recognisances of £100, and they must find two sureties in £50 each to keep the peace for twelve months; in default, three months' imprisonment. In the case of the younger defendant, her own recognisances would be £50, with two sureties of £25 each, the alternative being ten weeks' imprisonment.

Miss Pankhurst: I ask you to state a case on a point of law, namely, the construction of the leaflet.

The Magistrate: I shall not state a case.

Miss Pankhurst: I ask you to suspend judgment until after the return of a writ of certiorari.

The magistrate refused.

Established 1851.	BIRKBECK BANK.	Established 1851.
SOUTHAMPTON BUILDINGS, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.		
2½ PER CENT. INTEREST Allowed on Deposit Accounts. Repayable on Demand.		
2 PER CENT. INTEREST On Drawing Accounts with Cheque Book.		
ALL GENERAL BANKING BUSINESS TRANSACTED		
ALMANACK, with full particulars, POST FREE.		
C. F. RAVENCROFT, Secretary.		

SEVENTEEN WOMEN GO TO PRISON.

The seventeen women remanded for a week appeared before Mr. Curtis Bennett at Bow-street on Thursday.

Mr. H. Muskett prosecuted on behalf of the Commissioner of Police; Mr. W. Frost defended. All the defendants were charged with obstructing the police in the execution of their duty.

Mr. Frost, addressing the magistrate upon the cases generally, said he did not think the facts would be substantially in dispute, but the case that all the defendants wanted to bring forward was that they were genuinely and sincerely associated together in a certain political object, and it was only in pursuance of what they thought to be their rights for the furtherance of that object that they did what they did. They started from Caxton Hall with the avowed object of presenting a resolution to Mr. Asquith if they could get to the House of Commons, and if they could not get there they intended to go as far as they could. Only when they were stopped was their mission at an end. The deputation was escorted by the police a certain distance, but when they got to a particular point in Victoria-street they were ordered to turn back. They felt disappointed, and objected, and it was in respect of that objection taking a practical form that they were charged. When it was made clear that the police were not going to allow them to go on they submitted to arrest, and went quietly to the police-station. They did what they did in pursuance of what they believed to be their rights. It was admitted that they had no right to obstruct the police in the execution of their duty, but up to the moment they were stopped they were pursuing a course which, as citizens, they were entitled to pursue. In the majority of the cases the defendants felt that they were not at liberty to be bound over, and the alternative sentence of imprisonment would be the effective one. There was no question of riot, damage, or personal violence in what these ladies had done, and the charges had arisen out of their somewhat militant efforts to give effect to what they thought to be their rights.

Mr. Curtis Bennett said it was the duty of the Commissioner of Police to take such measures as he in his judgment felt right to take for the preservation of peace and order, and amongst those duties it was expressly cast upon him to keep, during the session of Parliament, the proximity thereto absolutely clear, and it was for him to say what was to be done. It was not for other people to come forward and say they intended to do certain things, such as getting into Parliament for the purpose of presenting anything whatever against the orders of the Commissioner. When the ladies arrived there they must have seen the nature of the police protection which was round the square, and the only possible thing that could have occurred to them if they persisted in going on was to get locked up. It was intolerable that any assembly of men and women should make a turmoil of the streets day after day, rendering it impossible for well-ordered and peaceable citizens to get to or from their places of business or residences without incurring the very greatest and grave difficulties. If the women would persist in this conduct steps must be taken to prevent it. It was absolutely impossible that such a state of things should be allowed to exist in a civilised community—that people should band themselves together to go here or there and do illegal things and not suffer for them. It did not matter what the sex was, but to his (the magistrate's) mind it was worse when it was the female sex which took a prominent part in these tumultuous assemblies. One had been brought up in the idea that the feminine sex was everything that was tender and kind and good, and that the idea of anything like being engaged in a tumultuous uproar was a thing to which they would never descend. Unfortunately it had been found lately that that old course had been departed from, and, as he had said, steps would have to be taken to prevent a recurrence of this kind of thing.

The seventeen women were then rapidly dealt with one after the other, the evidence in each case being practically the same, namely, that the defendant had broken, or endeavoured to break, through the police cordons.

The following were each ordered to be bound over in their own recognizances of £20, and to find a surety in £10 to be of good behaviour for twelve months, or to go to prison for one month:—

Maud Brindley, Florence Williams, Grace Hodgson Boutelle, Lettice Floyd, Winifred Bray, Elizabeth Billing, Mary A. M. Aldham, Ellen Smith, Jane Grey, Ada Flatman, Gertrude Llewellyn, Marian Wallace Dunlop, Gertrude Mary Ansell.

In three cases the alternative to finding a similar surety was 21 days' imprisonment, these being:—

Janet Coates, Amy Dorothy Shallard, and Kathleen Browne.

Mrs. Leigh, who has already served two months' imprisonment for breaking windows at No. 10, Downing-street, was ordered to enter into her own recognizances in £40 and to find a surety in £20, or go to prison for three months.

All the women refused to be bound over or to find sureties, and they were then removed to Holloway Gaol.

THE ARRESTS FOR DISTRIBUTING HANDBILLS.

The adjourned hearing of the charge against Mrs. Gaskell and Miss Smith, who were arrested in Piccadilly last week, was taken at Marlborough-street on Monday afternoon by Mr. Denman. Mr. E. B. Knight prosecuted for the Commissioner of Police, and Mr. Huntley Jenkins (instructed by Mr. A. Newton) appeared for the defence.

The allegation was that on the 19th inst. the women obstructed the footways by wearing posters and distributing handbills, and that wheeled traffic was dislocated in consequence of the crowds which followed them. Inspector Jacobs, cross-examined by Mr. Jenkins, said the women were sometimes on the footway, in the gutter, or on the kerb. In answer to Mr. Knight, he said that much of the obstruction was caused through drivers of vehicles slowing up or momentarily stopping to see what was on the posters. No particular crowd followed the women to the police station.

Mrs. Gaskell said she was instructed by the N.W.S.P.U. not to interfere in any way with the police regulations. She denied walking on the pavement except, "like any sandwichman," to avoid a vehicle. It was a lie to say that 30 persons followed them to the police station. She and other women had distributed bills in this way for months.

Mr. Denman said the question was whether an improper obstruction was caused in a public thoroughfare; if they would promise "not to distribute handbills in fantastic costumes" so as to cause obstruction he would discharge them.

Mr. Jenkins said there was nothing to corroborate in any substantial manner the story of obstruction.

Mr. Denman said the Act of Parliament forbidding anybody to obstruct the user of the highway must be enforced, whatever the motives of the person doing so might be. Having failed to obtain a promise from the defendants not to repeat their conduct, he should order them to be bound over in their own recognizances in £10 each to be of good behaviour for six months. The prisoners refused to sign anything or give any undertaking. They were discharged at the rising of the Court.

THE BATEMAN SANITARY LAUNDRY,

DYERS AND CLEANERS,

160, SHEPHERD'S BUSH ROAD.

K. F. THOMAS,
Member, N.W.S.P.U.

ALL MEMBERS INVITED.—Queen Square Club, 9, Queen-square, Bloomsbury, W.C. Miss CLARE REYNOLDS and Miss M. ROBERTA MILLS have the honour of announcing an EXHIBITION OF SKETCHES AND LEATHER WORK, on WEDNESDAY, November 4, 1908, from 8—11 p.m.

EDUCATIONAL, DOMESTIC, & GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AGENCY.

No Booking Fees.

Stamp for reply, GUILD, 35, Hart Street, W.C.



AMY KOTZE

"The Worker's Dress."

Specially Designed to Suit all Classes of Workers—
TEACHERS, STUDENTS, &c.

SLIGHTLY EMBROIDERED 2 Gns.

EXTRA EMBROIDERED, 2½ Gns.

Can be carried out with excellent effect in :: :: ::

Purple, Green, & White.

83, CROXTED RD.,
W. DULWICH, S.E.

EXTRACTS FROM THE PRESS.

"DAILY TELEGRAPH," October 26.

On Saturday the three leaders of the Suffragist party received their sentences from Mr. Curtis Bennett at Bow-street. The two elder women, inasmuch as they refused to be "bound over," were sent to prison for three months; the younger, for the same reason, is to be imprisoned for ten weeks. There was a great burst of cheering in honour of the defendants when they left the Court—not, apparently, confined to the sympathisers with the Suffragist cause—and the demonstration was only checked after some time, and with considerable difficulty. How the total result of the proceedings will strike the imagination and feelings of the public at large probably depends on the general attitude taken towards the movement. But we do not hesitate to say that there is no man of intelligence and humanity who can fail to regard the spectacle as infinitely sad and pitiful. Here are three women of ability and courage—ability which may be misused, and courage, possibly, shown in a wrong cause—who undergo a penalty ludicrously unfitted to the circumstances of the case, and in itself dishonourable as well as useless. Miss Christabel Pankhurst has proved herself possessed of no small amount of forensic skill and eloquence. Mrs. Pankhurst's concluding speech was recognised by all who heard it as a deeply-impressive appeal, replete with sincerity and simplicity. Mrs. Drummond is, at all events, a great organiser, a capable and vigorous woman, who has known how to carry on a difficult campaign with versatile energy. Everyone would admit that these are remarkable women, who have led the movement because they deserved to lead it, and because they are born with a real talent for generalship and organisation. We will put aside for the moment the character of the campaign they have been conducting, and the very natural and obvious criticism to which it has rendered itself liable. Nor do we raise any question of the justice of the sentence which Mr. Curtis Bennett found himself obliged to inflict. The programme issued by the Suffragists, with its suggestion that the House of Commons was to be "rushed," was a clear incitement to possible violence—especially if taken in connection with the meetings and temper of the unemployed. But, if we abstract temporarily from the surrounding circumstances and conditions the bare issue of the trial, we will ask any intelligent and humane man if he thinks that justice and right can possibly be satisfied by the incarceration of three defendants, who are not only women, but clever women, with ideas and principles which, whether we agree with them or not, are, at all events, honestly entertained and courageously applied. Let no one say that the same line of argument might be used to excuse an Anarchist and a bomb-thrower. The Anarchist is the enemy of the human race and the destroyer of society. A Suffragist believes that she is reforming society, and in any case is not the dangerous foe of humanity. The methods of these women may be unlawful as well as irritating; they may be in themselves perverse and mistaken; they may be injuring their cause instead of promoting it by their rash and undisciplined zeal. Nevertheless, the bare fact remains. Three able women have to go to prison because they want votes for their sex. They refuse to be "bound over," because they are honest enough not to undertake obligations which they know they will not fulfil. They receive sentences which put them on a level with common malefactors. Is this a result which can be called commendable or satisfactory, or even decent? Does not such a spectacle seem in the highest degree pitiful and degrading?

We do not hesitate to carry out considerations of this sort to their logical and legitimate issue. The time has come, in our opinion, when the whole case for women's suffrage ought to be considered in its length and breadth as having definitely come within the sphere of practical politics. It is of no use to repeat for the thousandth time the old arguments which prove, according to one set of philosophers, the congenital incapacity of women to form a judgment on social and political affairs, or suggest, according to other thinkers, that there is no such radical difference between the two sexes as would justify the practical disfranchisement of the greater half of humanity. The question has gone beyond the stage of theoretical and academic discussion. It is a problem which urgently demands a practical solution. We are also quite aware that there is a large body of Englishwomen who cannot believe in the advisability of possessing the right to vote, and who are at the present moment formed into an Anti-Suffragist Society in order expressly to combat the pretensions of their more active sisters. Probably in all the long development of electoral reform and the extension of the franchise there have been numerous male critics who either did not want a vote for themselves or insisted that it should be denied to some specified members of their own sex. But the great laws of progress sweep on in their majestic path, and, to the amazement and sometimes the disgust of philo-

sophers and politicians, democracy sees itself gradually established in the full recognition of its rights and privileges. No one doubts that a female franchise is the next step in the political evolution. Our colonies, which often make useful experiments which the Mother Country can study at her leisure, sufficiently prove the direction in which affairs are tending. We can no more stop the hands on the clock of progress than we can prevent ourselves from getting old. The more clearly the principle is established that government is for the people, worked in the interest of the people and by the people, the more certain is it that women cannot be permanently excluded from exercising votes which we give freely to men far inferior to them in intellect and authority. Why should the lady of the house be bereft of a privilege we freely concede to her butler? Of course, in a question like this, everything turns on detail. Under what conditions and with what arrangements are women to receive the political franchise? Is it to be "womanhood suffrage"? Or shall we carefully confine the vote to women who hold property of some sort and who pay rates and taxes? Are wives and daughters to be enfranchised, or single women and widows? There are all kinds of intricate issues involved, which may well engross the attention of thoughtful and far-seeing statesmen. But our point is that the time has now come for an intelligent study of the matter, on the assumption that "Votes for Women" have to find a place in the legislative programmes of the future. We have listened to much "argument about it and about"; let us no longer be content to come out of the same door by which we entered. It is no longer a subject for abstract generalisations. It is a problem which has become gravely and sternly practical.

"DAILY NEWS," October 26.

The three suffragist leaders who have elected to suffer imprisonment rather than be bound over to keep the peace have chosen the course which all anticipated, and which the view they take of their duty to their cause imposed upon them. Three women who have given conclusive proofs of an ability, tenacity, and courage which are rare in either sex, and which might have been employed for the general good in many directions had not the suffrage question stood in the way, are to be a useless charge upon society for weeks and months, with the certainty that their course of action and that of their supporters will not on that account be modified in the smallest degree. For our part, we are of those who will welcome with deep relief the coming day when the reform for which the suffragist leaders are contending will be made law, and the inevitable result of the enlargement to woman's part in life reached. In the meantime, the Ministry are not less determined that a momentous reform of the Constitution shall not take place in advance of public opinion as they read it; and the battle continues. It remains for us to plead, as we have already done, for scrupulous fairness in the handling by the authorities of a situation that is painful on any terms. It is urgently necessary that there should be no ground for the complaint that a dead set is being made at suffragist demonstrators to the exclusion of other breakers of the peace. Those who disturb and break up peaceable suffragist meetings, for instance, ought not to escape arrest—as they have done—while women are meeting with the legal consequences of disturbance and disorder; and no harm, to say the least of it, would be done by a definite assurance that no grounds exist for the suspicion, forcibly expressed in the course of the proceedings at Bow-street, that a particular line of action is being recommended from above to magistrates dealing with suffragist cases. The situation is not one for a simple insistence on legalities; it is a case for policy as well, and the steering of a course is no more easy for the Government than it is pleasant.

"DAILY CHRONICLE," October 26.

We wish that the magistrate had imposed shorter terms of imprisonment on the defendants, and had ordered them to be treated as first-class misdemeanants. A very broad line of demarcation separates the women suffrage leaders who come into conflict with the law from the ordinary female offender. This difference is recognised to some extent by their classification as "second-class prisoners." We gladly admit that the Home Secretary has recently so modified the regulations as to make the term of imprisonment much less trying and irksome to second-class misdemeanants. Why does not Mr. Gladstone go further and order that these three ladies, and indeed all the other suffragists in custody, shall be treated as first-class misdemeanants? That concession would be heartily approved by public opinion, which, though it is sometimes exasperated by the methods of the militant women, would have them treated with the utmost lenity for any technical infractions of the law into which they may be betrayed by excess of zeal.

The National Women's Social & Political Union.

OFFICE:

4, CLEMENTS INN, STRAND, W.C.

Telegraphic Address—"WOSPOLU, LONDON."

Telephone 5550 Holborn.

Mrs. PANKHURST,

Founder and Hon. Sec.

Mrs. PETHICK LAWRENCE,

Hon. Treasurer.

Mrs. TUKE,

Joint Hon. Sec.

Miss CHRISTABEL PANKHURST,

Organising Sec.

Constitution.

OBJECTS.—To secure for women the Parliamentary vote as it is or may be granted to men; to use the power thus obtained to establish equality of rights and opportunities between the sexes, and to promote the social and industrial well-being of the community.

METHODS.—The objects of the Union shall be promoted by—

1. Action entirely independent of all political parties.
2. Opposition to whatever Government is in power until such time as the franchise is granted.
3. Participation in Parliamentary Elections in opposition to the Government candidate, and independently of all other candidates.
4. Vigorous agitation upon lines justified by the position of outlawry to which women are at present condemned.
5. The organising of women all over the country to enable them to give adequate expression to their desire for political freedom.
6. Education of public opinion by all the usual methods, such as public meetings, demonstrations, debates, distribution of literature, newspaper correspondence, and deputations to public representatives.

MEMBERSHIP.—Women of all shades of political opinion who approve the objects and methods of the Union, and who are prepared to act independently of party, are eligible for membership. It must be clearly understood that no member of the Union shall support the candidate of any political party in Parliamentary elections until women have obtained the parliamentary vote. The entrance fee is 1s.

The Women's Social and Political Union are asking for votes for women on the same terms as they are possessed by men.

They are not asking for the vote for every woman, but that a woman shall not be refused a vote simply because she is a woman.

The Women's Social and Political Union claim that a simple measure, giving the vote to women on these terms, shall be passed this Session.

VICTORY.

"Thoughts have gone forth whose powers can sleep no more. Victory! Victory!"

To the women all over the world, and especially to the women of this country, we bring good tidings of great joy. Rejoice, for a great victory has been won of light over darkness, of truth over ignorance and prejudice, of love over ruthlessness, of justice over wrong, of the human spirit over the forces that would imprison it. It has been won by women, for women, and through women for the whole human race.

"Victory"! you say, it may be wonderingly, "Victory"? with the great-souled founder of our Union in prison? With our cool-headed politician and brilliant orator silenced in a solitary cell? With the capable and energetic organiser of our forces withdrawn just at the moment when her personal services seemed so indispensable? But we tell you what is true.

Our loss is great, but these brave women would tell you and we tell you to-day that the gain is greater, infinitely greater. All the strain and suffering through which our leaders have gone during the past week, all the hardships and indignity and horrible torture—for prison is torture to any temperament so highly organised and sensitive as theirs—which they have yet to undergo, are lightly esteemed by them because they know that by this suffering they have paid the price that has to be paid before the deliverance of women from the bondage of ages can be accomplished; because they realise that spiritual forces born of action have gone forth to conquer the world in the name of faith, and hope, and love.

What a scene it was last Saturday in the Police-court! I believe there was hardly one person present who did not realise that he or she, as a mere spectator only, was taking part in the greatest event that had ever even remotely touched their lives.

Everything tended to bring out into strong relief the helplessness, the innocence, and the nobility of the women stand-

ing in the dock. Everyone knew that they were being tried not for a criminal offence but for a political offence. The admission of this fact was extracted from the two Cabinet Ministers examined by Miss Pankhurst. Everybody knew it. Yet the wording of the summons and the conduct of the prosecution was so artfully contrived as to give the magistrate power to disallow any appeal to a higher court suitable for the trial of a political offence. In every way they were placed by the procedure of the Police-court at an unfair disadvantage.

But a more serious aspect of the matter was disclosed during the course of this mockery of a trial. There has long been reason to suspect that when women are tried in connection with this movement, prosecutor, witnesses, and judge are all one and the same, and are all the tools of a Government which is hostile to women's enfranchisement and which bitterly represents the political agitation which is being carried on so successfully against it. Now the suspicion has been established as a fact. We have now had testimony on oath that at least on one occasion the punishment to be dealt out to women charged with a breach of the public peace in connection with this movement was decided before the magistrate came into court, and that no argument or evidence or appeal could be of any avail. The bandage of impartiality with which justice should ever be blindfolded was slipped up, the scales in which right and wrong should be balanced were weighted, and sentence of judgment was dictated by malice and by political vindictiveness. That such things can be in this 20th century is a grave scandal, and a menace of danger to the whole community.

Everybody in the court on Saturday last knew that no jury of their own countrymen would have convicted the women who stood in the dock, but would have acquitted them of the charge brought against them, as a British jury acquitted John Burns at the Old Bailey. The language used by John Burns was far more inflammatory and irresponsible than any words have been of the leaders of this movement, who have always urged upon their followers the utmost self-restraint.

But they were not allowed trial by their countrymen; and the magistrate refused to state a case, or allow adjournment for an appeal to a higher court.

And yet, was there one person in that court who did not realise that these women in the dock were upheld and supported by powers that are greater and stronger than anything in the world? Did anyone doubt for one moment that these women stood on the winning side? Truly I think not. As we heard the inspired and courageous utterances, as we felt the hush that fell upon all in that court, and became conscious of the spiritual presence filling the place, making it holy as a church, did we not know with utmost certainty of knowledge that forces had been generated then and there that would continue to act and react, not only during our lifetime, but for many generations to come?

I venture to assert that there was not one individual present whose after life will not be vitally influenced by that scene. I should not be surprised to hear of some great change effected in some man's or some woman's career. Silently and secretly, if not openly and visibly, by every spiritual law, results must follow fraught with significance to this generation and to the future.

I would that all the people in this country could have been there. The printed words will go out with their message to the world, but the personality of those who uttered them, and the spiritual force and magnetism by which they were inspired cannot be reproduced in the same form. Those spiritual forces have gone forth into the world to work according to deep and mystic laws which are hidden from our understanding. One thing only we understand and know. We know that the spirit of divine and self-sacrificing love which moved our leaders to lay down days and weeks and months of their life, and makes them prepared at any time to lay down life itself, should the demand for that sacrifice arise, is the strongest thing in the world. It is stronger than prison walls, for it is stronger even than the grave. That spirit they have communicated to the other women who are in prison for the same cause to-day. That spirit they have communicated to us who are left in the outside world. By that spirit they have won the battle. It only remains for us to go forward and claim the deliverance.

"Thoughts have gone forth whose powers can sleep no more. Victory! Victory!"

Emmeline Pethick Lawrence.

THE SPEECHES FROM THE DOCK

By CHRISTABEL PANKHURST, LL.B., MRS. PANKHURST, and MRS. DRUMMOND.

CHRISTABEL PANKHURST.

In the first place, I want to point out that the proceedings that have been taken against us have been taken out of malice and for vexation. I think I shall have little difficulty in proving this, because of the attitude which the authorities have taken against us from the beginning of the agitation, which has been in progress for the past three years. But before I come to this point, I want to draw your attention, and the attention of the general public—the Magistrate: Never mind the general public—your attention, sir, to the very serious scandal which has been unearthed in the course of these proceedings. We have had it sworn to in the witness-box, that one of the justices, Mr. Horace Smith, has allowed himself to be coerced by the Government, and has settled in conjunction with them whether a certain lady, charged in connection with this agitation, was guilty, before the evidence was heard, and Mr. Horace Smith and the Government had, moreover, decided beforehand what term of imprisonment should be inflicted upon that lady.

Now, this policy of the Government of weighting the scales against us is not of interest only to us, but is of interest to the whole community. In the course of British history we have seen many struggles for the purification of our judicial system. It is within your knowledge, sir, that in days gone by the judges have had many a fight against the King, in order to maintain their independence and to vindicate the purity of their office. It has been left to the twentieth century—it has been left to these so-called democratic days—to see our judicial system corrupted for party ends. I am glad that we have been able to perform the public duty and service of doing something to attack this evil while it is in the bud. I am quite sure that if we had not been privileged to unearth this very serious scandal, that the process of corruption would have gone on until a fair trial was absolutely impossible in the case of those charged with political offences. And if injustice creeps in in political cases, it would not be long before the same corruption was prevalent in every law court in the land, and in the case of every person brought up under some charge, no matter of what kind.

I think too much attention cannot be paid to the disgraceful action of the Government; the Home Secretary and his colleagues have disgraced and degraded themselves. They have been false to their duty, they have tried to destroy the liberties which it has taken so long to build up. It is worth while standing in this dock if we have been able to do no more than do something to check a state of affairs which is going to reduce this country below the level of any other civilised country if it is not stopped and stamped out now. The Liberal Government have outdone the monarchs of old times in their attempt to corrupt the fountain of British justice; and both they and the magistrate who has allowed himself to be made a tool, who has so far forgotten his duty to us, his duty to the public, his duty to his profession, deserve to be hounded out of civilised society. I know that this action the Government have taken in corrupting the justices will not be forgotten, and will be remembered against them when next they face the verdict of popular opinion.

A Malicious Prosecution.

I shall now proceed with my argument that these proceedings have been taken against us out of malice and in order to lame, in an illegitimate way, a political enemy. Take the form of the summons. We are not openly charged with the offence of illegal assembly. If we have in any way broken the law, we have broken it in that way. The only charge that could possibly be preferred against us is that of illegal assembly. Now, why have the authorities, why have the Government feared to take this course? The reason is that they want to keep us in the police-court. They believe, rightly or wrongly, that by this means they will succeed in prejudicing the public against us. We know perfectly well that up till recently the general public shunned the police-court as a disgraceful place. The fact of having been proceeded against in a police-court was in the eyes of the ordinary man or woman a stain upon the character which could hardly be wiped out in later days. Well,

I think that by our presence here we have done something to relieve the police-court of that unenviable reputation. We have done something to raise its status in the public eye, and we have also done something to throw light upon the obsolete procedure, and the unsuitable procedure which obtains in courts like this. But even if the procedure which we find here is suitable for committing "drunks," I am sure every reasonable person will agree that it is no place for the political offender. But political offenders are brought here in order that something may be done to smirch their character, and to prejudice them in the public eye.

Another reason why the authorities have feared to charge us with unlawful assembly is that they dare not see this case come before a jury. They know perfectly well that if this case was heard before a jury of our countrymen we should be acquitted, just as John Burns was acquitted years ago for taking action far more serious, far more dangerous to the public peace than anything that we have done. Yes, I say they are afraid of sending us before a jury, and I am quite sure that this will be obvious to the public, and that the Government will suffer by the underhand, the unworthy, and the disgraceful subterfuge by which they have removed this case to what we can only call a Star Chamber of the twentieth century. Yes, this is a Star Chamber, and it is in order to huddle us into prison without a fair trial that these proceedings have been taken in their present form. I daresay it was not anticipated by the prosecution that this case was ever to be defended. I am quite sure it has come to them as a surprise; they are accustomed to see us disposed of and sent to Holloway Gaol very much as the animals are dealt with in the Chicago stockyards. Prisoners are brought up here and disposed of at the rate of one a minute, or, perhaps, three in two minutes! That sort of thing has been the rule; we are accustomed to that. But those days are gone for ever. We are going to make this time a fight for our liberty. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to our country that we should not let the disgraceful proceedings of this court go on any longer. Yes, we are deprived of trial by jury. We are also deprived of the right of appeal against the magistrate's decision. Very, very carefully has this procedure been thought out; very, very cunningly has it been thought out to hedge us in on every side, and to deprive us of our rights in the matter!

We Will Not be Bound Over.

Then, we are also rendered liable to six months' imprisonment, and yet we are denied the privileges in making our defence that people liable to three months' imprisonment alone enjoy. We shall be told in the House of Commons no doubt—we have been told the same thing before now—that we are only bound over, we need not go to prison, if we go to prison we have only ourselves to thank. Well, if Mr. Herbert Gladstone were in the dock that would be perfectly true. He would be very willing, as a Member of Parliament was only yesterday, to be bound over, to express his repentance, to say he will not repeat the conduct that he has pursued up to now. But we are not prepared to betray our cause; we are not prepared to put ourselves in a false position. If the case is decided against us, if we are called upon to be bound over, it must be remembered that that amounts to imprisoning us, and that therefore the authorities cannot possibly escape their responsibility for sending us to prison by saying that we could be at liberty if we liked.

To sum up what I have just said, Magna Carta has been practically torn up by the present Government. We are liable to a term of so long as six months' imprisonment, and we have had no fair trial. We protest against that with all the force at our disposal. We think it is a disgrace; we think it is a scandal; we think the way in which we have been proceeded against disgraces the Government, and when we add to that the fact that they have attempted—and possibly still attempt—to corrupt justice, and decide the sentences upon us before we come up for trial, when we take these two facts in conjunction, I think you will agree with us that it is not we who ought to be in the dock to-day, but the people who are responsible for such a monstrous state of affairs.

I want now to deal with the reasons for issuing this bill. We do not deny at all that we issued this bill; none of us three here wish to deny responsibility. We did issue the bill; we did cause it to be circulated; we did put upon it the words "Come and help the Suffragettes to rush the House of Commons." For these words we do not apologise; for our action we do not apologise. We had good reason for taking it, and what is more, at the first opportunity—on the first occasion when we think it desirable—we shall do it again!

Why We Issued the Bill.

Now, it is very well known that we take this action in order to press forward a claim, which, according to the British Constitution, we are well entitled to make. After all, we are seeking only to enforce the observance of the law of the land. The law of the land is that taxation and representation must go together. The law of the land is that who obeys laws must have a share in making them. Therefore, when we claim the Parliamentary vote, we are asking the Government to abandon the illegal practice of denying representation to those who have a perfect right to enjoy it. For 40 years women have claimed that the law should be obeyed; for 40 years Governments have been called upon to cease from unconstitutional action, and to carry out the law of the land—to obey Magna Carta. Our agitations peacefully conducted, our petitions, our public meetings have been disregarded. Now we have in power a Liberal Government professing to believe in that principle, I say, but refusing to carry it into practice. We have appealed to them, we have called upon them for justice, we have demanded of them that they do what we ask them—without the smallest success. We have a Prime Minister who will not even receive a deputation. Time after time have we wended our way to the House of Commons with a view to asking him to see us. Sometimes—generally—we have not called upon the general public to be with us at all, we have not asked them to come in their thousands to give us their support, we have gone alone; but that has made absolutely no difference to the case. We might go 3, we might go 6, we might go 13, we might go 60,000 strong, but the result is the same. We are sometimes escorted to the House of Commons, but we are arrested if we insist upon our right to enter. Well, what has happened? We have been arrested, and we have been imprisoned without trial—for I will not dignify these proceedings in the police-court with the name of trial—we have been imprisoned without trial. Sometimes the police have arrested us on our emerging from the Caxton Hall, sometimes they have escorted us to the door of the House of Commons, and there we have been arrested. The result has always been the same. We have been deprived of our constitutional right to see the Prime Minister, and we have been arrested for attempting to do so.

A Constitutional Right.

Now, I want here to insist upon the action which we have taken in these proceedings. We have a perfectly constitutional right to go ourselves in person to lay our grievances before the House of Commons, and as one witness—an expert student of history—pointed out to you, we are but pursuing a legitimate course which in the old days women pursued without the smallest interference by the authorities. Now, the principal point we had in view in issuing the handbill for the 13th of October was to call upon the House of Commons to carry into law a Bill, the second reading of which has already been carried. We have met with many refusals already to carry that Bill, and therefore we thought it necessary to make some demonstration of popular support. The Prime Minister has challenged us to do it. We gathered together in Hyde Park on June 21 an immense, a vast audience, but that meeting in Hyde Park was absolutely ignored. It remained for us then to summon our friends to meet us nearer the House of Commons itself. We did this on June 30. No proceedings were taken against us. No harm was done then, as no harm was done on October 13. We were allowed to do without opposition in June what we are punished for doing—or, at least, prosecuted for doing—on October 13. Well, this handbill we felt to be necessary in order to put the final pressure upon the Government, with a view to getting the measure carried this Session. The time now remaining is short; a firm stand we felt must be taken. The time of the House is being occupied by matters far less important than that which we have on hand. Juvenile smoking, the Education Bill—which nobody is eager upon—the Licensing Bill, which the Government hardly expect to carry. With these matters the time of the House is being wasted, while a far greater measure awaits their consideration. We felt we must bring pressure to bear upon the Government with a view to getting the Bill carried, but before we took the action of which the prosecution complain, we desired to make our position clear, and we therefore wrote to the Prime Minister as follows:—

I am instructed by the Committee of the National Women's Social and Political Union to write you as to the intentions of His Majesty's Government with regard to the measure introduced by Mr. Stanger, M.P., which passed second reading by a large majority.

At many very large demonstrations, held all over the country, resolutions have been carried with practical unanimity, calling upon the Government to adopt this Bill, and pass it into law this year. At a succession of by-elections the voters have shown unmistakably their desire that the Government should deal with the question without further delay.

We shall esteem it a favour if you will inform us whether it is the intention of the Government to carry the Women's Enfranchisement Bill during the Autumn Session of Parliament.

To that letter we had an unfavourable reply, and it was in consequence of the unfavourable nature of that reply that the arrangements for October 13 were proceeded with. In consequence of the unsatisfactory attitude of the Government, our plans went forward, and I would remind you that in making these arrangements we were but acting literally upon the advice given by John Bright in 1867. I do not know how it was that John Bright escaped being prosecuted by the Government of his day for inciting the public to the commission of an unlawful act, for he called upon the people of London, called upon the men who wanted votes, if they hoped to succeed, to gather in their thousands in the space which extends from Trafalgar-square to the Houses of Parliament. I cannot imagine why, if this Government think it necessary to proceed against us, that an earlier Government should not have done the same thing. I can only suppose that the Government of that day had more sense of proportion, more sense of their own duty, were less panic-stricken and more courteous, and more disposed to do their duty to the public, because in view of such words as John Bright used (with the possibility that the action he counselled would be taken), they resolved to give the men of this country their political rights, and the Reform Bill of 1867 was carried into law. In passing, I would suggest that to take such a course as that in regard to our movement would be more creditable to the Government than the course of instituting legal proceedings against us.

The Word "Rush."

Now, I want to deal with the meaning of the word "rush." You have stated, sir, that the meaning of this word is a matter of law, but you have been good enough to allow us to ask a large number of witnesses the meaning of the word "rush," and all these witnesses have told us that, according to the British interpretation of the word "rush," no violence was counselled. Now, the word "rush" appears to be very much the rage just now. Nobody can get away from its use. We find that at a meeting of the League for the Preservation of Swiss Scenery Mr. Richard Whiteing, discussing the question of Swiss railways, said they ought not to be too hard on railways. Under certain atmospheric conditions a railway was the most beautiful thing in the world. He made other remarks about railways, and then he proceeded to suggest that a general rush to the Italian Alps might induce the Swiss to listen to reason. Well, I do not think that anyone here would suggest that Mr. Whiteing meant to offer any violence to the Swiss in his use of the word "rush." He meant to imply that a speedy advance should be made to the Italian Alps. Then we have Mr. McKinnon Wood counselling the electors to rush the County Council, and get a lady elected to that body. I want to submit that "rush" as a transitive verb cannot mean "attack," "assail," "make a raid upon," or anything of that kind. The "Century Dictionary," which is the largest and most authoritative completed dictionary of the English language, gives numerous instances, all of which imply "hurry" or "hasten," it may be to unduly hurry—although, of course, we have waited so long that undue haste is not to be wondered at. "To unduly hurry" or "hasten," but never "to assail." Now, I have in my hand a little leaflet, which someone has been good enough to send to me. It is used in America, and it is put upon parcels which are expected to reach their destination in good time; when a parcel is wanted to be sent by an express train, they put this label, "Rush by first train leaving." Well, as our witnesses have one and all testified, the interpretation they placed upon the word "rush" was that they should make haste. We have heard various meanings attributed to the word "rush" by dictionaries. "Rush" equals "an eager demand"; "urgent pressure" (as of business); a "rusher" is "a go-ahead person"—so says Chambers' English Dictionary. "Rush" means "an eager demand"—this we find in Ogilvie's Imperial Dictionary. "Rush" means "to go forward over-hastily"; for example, a number of Bills are rushed through Parliament—or a case is rushed through a law court. Then we have "on the rush," meaning "in a hurry." "In modern colloquial language," says Farmer and Henley's Dictionary of Slang, "rush" enters largely. As a substantive, it means "extreme urgency of affairs," "an eager demand"; as a verb, it means "to hurry," "to force," or "to advance a matter with undue haste." "On the rush," or "with a rush," means "with spirit," "energetically." "On the rush" means "on the run," "hard at it." One witness told us that, in her opinion, the word "rush," used as we have used it, might be compared with the word "dash," as we have it used in the expression, "a dash for the Pole." Everybody knows that you cannot get to the Pole in a

hurry, but you can try to get there in a hurry, and that is what "a dash to the Pole" means. Everybody knows that with a timid Government like the present one in power, having at its service the entire Metropolitan Police force, if one woman says she is going to rush the House of Commons, there will be an immense number of police to prevent her from doing it. Nobody, then, having regard to the facts I have mentioned, thought the women would rush the House of Commons, but that they would be there—it may be there with their supporters—to show their indignation against the Government, and I am glad to say that they were there. It may mean six months' imprisonment, but I think it is worth it.

Now, if we had used the expression "storm the House of Commons," I could understand that a little fear would creep into the heart of Mr. Herbert Gladstone, because we know he is a rather timid person. It was all very well for him to say in the witness-box that he knows no fear, but the facts are against him. I know perfectly well that when we are in any physical danger, as we sometimes are at meetings, owing to the kind and considerate remarks of Cabinet Ministers, no such elaborate police precautions are taken for our protection as are taken for the House of Commons in general, and Cabinet Ministers in particular, when there is thought to be any demonstration contemplated.

An Illegal Act?

Now, the next question I want to raise is this: Is it, as a matter of fact, an illegal thing to rush the House of Commons? The only woman who has done it has gone scot free. Mrs. Travers Symons rushed the House of Commons. She got in by strategy. She eluded the police, she got in, and she rushed the House of Commons. Nobody seems to mind her having done it at all; no proceedings have been taken against her. There she is! We who have not rushed the House of Commons are in the dock! Is her action illegal? She did it as the consequence of words that we had written and spoken—she is the only person who has actually succeeded in carrying out the mandate we are considered to have given to the public. She is the only person who has rushed the House of Commons, and yet she is not supposed to have broken the law of the land. Still, if she who has done it, is not to be punished, it is an extraordinary thing that we, who have not done it, are liable to imprisonment at the present moment.

We can take another instance of someone who not only "rushed" the House of Commons, but stormed the House of Commons, and sent the members of the House of Commons flying in all directions. We have the case of Cromwell. I am not aware that he was ever made the subject of legal proceedings. It may be that by seeking to enter the House of Commons we have infringed the Speaker's regulations, but we have certainly not infringed the law of the land. We are told in our summons that it is not only illegal, but it is both wrongful and illegal. Well, you may say it is wrongful according to some moral law. We do not. It is rightful according to every law. But we want to know how it can be said that it is an illegal act. We are anxious to know by what statute it is illegal to go to the House of Commons, walk up the steps, and make our way to the strangers' entrance? We should like to know whether that is an illegal thing to do, and, if it is not illegal to go at a slow pace, we should like to know whether it is illegal to go at a quick pace, because that is what the word "rush" means. To "rush the House of Commons" is to go with all possible speed inside the House of Commons, and I hope that we shall be told what statute we have contravened by doing it ourselves, or sending anybody to do it, or inviting others to do it.

Now, the prosecution have drawn attention to the speeches made in Trafalgar-square on October 11. We do not in any way object to their doing this. I do not think what we have said there is strictly relevant, but I am glad they have raised this point, because it is all in our favour. We have called a number of witnesses, who have told us that they heard the speeches on that occasion, that they heard us interpreting the bill, because the speeches made there were made in interpretation of the famous bill. They have heard our speeches, and have one and all said that there was nothing inflammatory in those speeches, that there was no incitement to violence whatever. I am quite content to abide by the story of the other side in regard to this matter. The witnesses called by the prosecution all say that we used the following words, and I am sure no rational person can find in these words anything which incites to violence, and if the meaning of the word "rush" is to be drawn from these speeches, then it will be a monstrous miscarriage of justice if we are sentenced to imprisonment. Here are the words spoken by Mrs. Pankhurst:—

On Tuesday evening, at Caxton Hall, we shall ask those who support women to come to Parliament Square. There will be a deputation of women who have no right in the House of Commons to a seat there, such as men have. The Government does not know its own mind, it changes so. But we do know that we want the vote, and mean to have it.

Then we have my own remarks:—

I wish you all to be there on the evening of the 13th, and I hope that that will be the end of this movement. On June 30 we succeeded in driving Mr. Asquith underground. He is afraid of us, and so are the Government. Years ago John Bright told the people that it was only by lining the streets from Charing Cross to Westminster that they could impress the Government. Well, we are only taking a leaf out of his book. We want you to help the women to rush their way into the House of Commons. You won't get locked up, because you have the vote. If you are afraid, we will take the lead, and you will follow us. We are not afraid of imprisonment. We know we shall win because we are in the right.

These are the very dreadful words uttered on the platform that day; but what is even more important, because it comes direct from the pen of Mrs. Pankhurst, and ought to be listened to and taken into account far more than anything that we are reported to have said, are these words, written by Mrs. Pankhurst as an order to our members and to the general public:—

On the 13th, in Parliament Square, there will be many thousands of people to see fair play between the women and the Government. Let us keep their support and co-operation by showing them, as we have done before, with what quiet courage, self-restraint, and determination women are fighting against tyranny and oppression on the part of a Government which has been called the strongest of modern times. It is by the exercise of courage and self-restraint and persistent effort that we shall win in this unequal contest.

Now, returning to the question of the Trafalgar-square meeting, we have been able to get evidence from a Cabinet Minister, and he tells us that he heard nothing of an inflammatory nature in Trafalgar-square. He did not hear us counsel people to do violence, he did not hear us counsel the people to do harm, he did not hear us say that we ourselves should do anything violent; in fact, if the matter were to rest upon words that he has spoken, it would certainly appear to everybody that we have said nothing to the public which could be taken as inciting them to do anything violent or illegal. We are quite prepared to take our stand upon what Mr. Lloyd George said of the words we spoke in Trafalgar-square.

The Events of the 13th.

Now, let us come to the events of the 13th of October. The prosecution suggested—it was in some way raised by them—that Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, the chairman of the Caxton Hall meeting, had counselled violence to the women who were going forth into the streets to seek an interview with the Prime Minister. Well, we were able to call a great deal of evidence to show that that was an absolute fabrication. Mrs. Pethick Lawrence did not counsel the use of force; she urged the women to meet physical force with spiritual force; to show determination, and to make their way forward so far as they could, and not to be deterred lightly from entering the House; but as for the use of force directed against the police, directed against property, directed against Members of Parliament or Cabinet Ministers, she deprecated the use of such force, and discountenanced it. So that we have been able to clear ourselves of any suggestion that wild or inflammatory language was spoken in the Caxton Hall on the 13th.

An Orderly Crowd.

Now, as to what happened outside on the 13th. We have heard over and over again that this was the most orderly crowd that has ever been known within the memory of living people to assemble in the streets of London. Mr. Lloyd George thought so little of its dangers that he actually brought with him his young daughter of six years. It is all very well for him to say that he relied upon the police arrangements. It is obvious to any intelligent person that 6,000 police are no match for 60,000 people if they really desired to force a way through the police lines. If there had been a violent spirit in that crowd, the police would have been as nothing, they would not have been able to restrain the crowd, and Mr. Lloyd George and his daughter, and even the police line would have been brushed aside, had the people been incited by us to do any violence. As a matter of fact, they knew what we wanted them to do, and they did it, and the fact that this child was brought into the crowd by her father shows that there was no apprehension in anybody's mind of any harm being done. But it is not because of anything serious that occurred on that night, or was expected to occur, that we are here; we are here in order that we may be kept out of the way for some months, and may cease from troubling the Government for as long a period as they can find it in them, or for which the public will allow them, to deprive us of our liberty.

We have had Mr. Herbert Gladstone telling us that he was not afraid on that night. Well, if there had been any danger, he would have been afraid. It was because he knew perfectly well that that public had no hostile intention, and that we had no hostile intention, that he ventured to come into the streets. If there had been a riot, if there had been a violent mob, he would have kept very carefully in the House of Commons, and it is perfectly absurd to argue that he thought the crowd was a disorderly one.

While we can show from our evidence that this was an orderly crowd, what have we got on the other side? We have two police officers. That has been the only evidence that has been brought

against us. I think it is a monstrous thing if the evidence of two police officers, however reliable, however worthy they may be, is to be believed against the host of witnesses that we have already called, and the large number of witnesses that we could have called to say the same thing. It seems to me that there is no justice in this court if the word of the police is to be believed against the public. I want to call your attention to the fact that the prosecution have been unable to bring forward any impartial person to say that the events of the 13th were a danger to the public streets. This state of affairs must end. It is in the public interest that it should. It is not right that police evidence should be the only evidence upon which we are to be judged. It seems to me that the prosecution, the witnesses, the authorities, the magistrates, are all on one side, they are all in the same box, and the prisoner charged with an offence is absolutely helpless whatever facts he may bring forward. Those facts are set aside. It is indeed a waste of time to bring forward evidence in a police-court. Over the doors of this court ought to be the motto: "Abandon hope all ye who enter here." We do not care for ourselves, because imprisonment is nothing to us; but when we think of the thousands of helpless creatures who come into this monstrous place, and know perfectly well that they are found guilty before they have a chance of defending themselves, it is almost too terrible to think of the horrible injustice that is done day after day in these courts. Nobody to help them, nobody to plead for them. But I am thankful to think that we have been able, by submitting ourselves to the absurd proceedings that are conducted here, to ventilate this fearful wrong.

Well, I say that the crowd was orderly, and nobody could compare it with other crowds. The Eucharistic Procession drew together a far more disorderly crowd than that which we assembled, and yet, who has been proceeded against for that? Nobody has. Somebody ought to be in the dock, because they brought together a crowd which might possibly have led to riot and bloodshed. As for the Protestants who threatened that if they did not get their own way there would be bloodshed, no proceedings have been taken against them. Why are they not bound over? How anybody can say that we are treated with fair play I do not know. These things will be written up against the Government in the time to come.

Take the crowd which assembled for the C.I.V.'s, and the crowd which assembled on Mafeking night—we all know, and our witnesses have said, that there was a disorderly crowd, yet nobody was proceeded against. Why, even at the Churchill wedding the crowd was far more violent than that of the 13th. The crowds that try to get in and hear a popular preacher are more disorderly than the crowd which came to support us on the 13th. Of the Jubilee procession the same thing has been said. The crowds at Lord Mayors' Shows, too, are more disorderly, while at a meeting in Trafalgar square some years ago bloodshed was narrowly averted, and yet the man who was responsible for it was acquitted by his countrymen.

Now, the prosecution have said that owing to the crowd brought together by us on the 13th 40 watches and purses were stolen. Are we to take the responsibility for that? Are we to be responsible for the stealing of 40 watches and purses? Why, I daresay 60 watches are stolen when the King goes to open Parliament!

There is not a single arrest which is traceable to the issue of our bill. Are we to understand that, once arrested, you are deemed guilty before you are tried? We know that in the higher courts the assumption is that a prisoner is innocent before he is proved to be guilty, but in this Court the assumption is that the prisoner is guilty before he is tried, and it is only in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred that he has a chance of getting off. People would have been there whether there had been a bill or not. Members of our Union would have been there whether there had been a crowd or not. The arrests have nothing to do with our action on the 13th, and therefore we deny absolutely the statement that because we issued that bill arrests were made. We are not responsible for pickpockets, they may be arrested whether we have a bill or not; we are not responsible for "drunks," and we are not responsible for the unemployed; we are responsible for ourselves, and as for the deputation, they were arrested not because we had issued a bill, but because they wanted to see the Prime Minister.

It is very interesting to notice what very elaborate police arrangements were made on the 12th. It just shows that members of the Government are afraid of their own shadow. I am glad they are reduced to this state of panic, because we shall get justice out of them. At present they are in fear lest they be a little inconvenienced, lest they be unable to get home and back again because of the crowds round the House of Commons.

Following the Advice of Statesmen.

Now I come to another point—that in taking the course we are taking we have been encouraged by statesmen, and especially by Liberal statesmen. The whole of our liberties have been won by

action such as ours, only of a far more violent kind. We have not broken the law, though we have offended certain persons who seem to think they can do injustice and escape with impunity. They seem to think they can have their cake and eat it. Well, we are prepared to show them that they cannot.

Therefore, we repudiate the charge that we are law-breakers. Still, we are prepared to say that even if we were law-breakers, we should be justified in being so. Magna Carta itself was won by a threat of a breach of the peace. Hampden, whom we all honour now, was a law-breaker. Charles I., because he did not rule in a manner acceptable to his subjects—just as Mr. Asquith is not ruling to-day in a manner acceptable to us—was beheaded. Revolution after revolution has marked the progress of our country. The Reform Bills were got by disorder. We are told that, prior to 1832, the Mansion House, the Custom House, the Bishop's Palace, the Excise Office, three prisons, four toll-houses, and 42 private dwellings and warehouses were burnt. There was a general rebellion, but as a consequence the Reform Bill of 1832 was won. Then we have the Reform Bill of 1867. That was won in consequence of the breaking down of the Hyde Park railings. In 1884 we had the Aston Park riots. They made it impossible for the legislators or any section of them to withstand the enfranchisement of the agricultural labourers!

I think I have already quoted the example set us by John Bright. Although he got off scot-free, we are now liable to a long term of imprisonment. Then there were the Fenian outrages, the killing of a policeman in Manchester, and the blowing up of Clerkenwell Gaol.

Mr. Gladstone himself said:—

The whole question of the Irish Church was dead; nobody cared for it, nobody paid attention to it in England. Circumstances occurred which drew the attention of people to the Irish Church. When it came to this that a great gaol in the heart of the metropolis was broken open under circumstances which drew the attention of English people to the state of Ireland, and when a Manchester policeman was murdered in the exercise of his duty, at once the whole country became alive to Irish questions, and the question of the Irish Church revived.

And in a subsequent explanation he said:—

When at an election you say that a question is out of the range of practical politics, you mean it is not a question likely to be dealt with in the Parliament you are now choosing. That is the meaning of it. It was said, and truly said, that in the year 1867 there happened certain crimes in England—that is to say, a policeman was murdered in circumstances of riot and great excitement at Manchester; the wall of Clerkenwell Prison was blown down in a very alarming manner—in consequence of which, it was said, I change my mind about the Irish Church.

To explain how the matters referred to had had the effect of drawing the attention of the people of this country to the Irish question, he says that agitation of this kind is like the ringing of the church bell; it reminds those who were forgetting to go to church, that it is time they were up and doing, to perform their religious duty.

Then there was Chamberlain threatening to march one hundred thousand men on London. Now, what difference is there between his action and ours, except that his action was far more likely to lead to law-breaking than any action we have taken. He proposed to bring a mob to storm the House of Commons. Was he prosecuted? No! The Gladstone of those days was a less absurd and hesitating and cowardly and peaceful person than the Gladstone of this time and the colleagues of the present Gladstone, and therefore Mr. Gladstone took the statesmanlike action of pressing forward the Reform Bill instead of taking proceedings against Mr. Chamberlain. And so Mr. Chamberlain was not legally proceeded against, and when a vote of censure was moved in the House of Commons, even that was defeated. On that occasion Mr. Gladstone said that if no instructions had been issued to the people of this country in political crises save only to remember to hate violence and love order and exercise patience, the liberties of this country would never have been attained.

Then there was Lord Randolph Churchill, who spoke words which were literally disgraceful for a public man addressing those who were voters. He counselled the voters—and, mind you, those who have votes have not the excuse for violence that those who have not got votes have—he counselled the voters to resort to the supreme arbitrament of force. He said, "Ulster will fight, and Ulster will be right," and as a consequence of what he said, dangerous riots, increasing in fury until they almost amounted to warfare, occurred in the streets, firearms were freely used by the police and by the combatants. Houses were sacked, and men and women were killed. So savage, repeated, and prolonged were the disturbances, breaking out again and again in spite of all efforts to suppress them, that they became in the end the subject of a Parliamentary Commission. But the author of these riots was not made the victim of prosecution. He was not placed in the dock; he was not proceeded against. What a monstrous thing it is that we who have led to no trouble, who have not caused the loss of a single life, who have not caused damage to property, who have not done any harm at all, we should be imprisoned, or threatened with imprisonment, while a man who spoke those words, who counselled action which resulted in the death of his fellow countrymen, should be allowed to escape without even a vote of censure!

If the Government had been as vindictive as the present one, penal servitude for life would have been the fate of Lord Randolph Churchill because of his encouragement to murderous attacks. He certainly was deserving of some punishment. But we, who have broken no law, or urged others to do so, we are threatened with this long term of imprisonment.

Then there was John Burns, who was far, far more violent; who was absolutely unrestrained in his language, which was utterly irresponsible—this man was brought up at the Old Bailey, and acquitted. If we were at the Old Bailey, I feel sure we should be acquitted; that is why we are not allowed to go there. He said in his speech that he was a rebel, because he was an outlaw. Well, that fact will support us in all that we have done. If we go to far greater lengths than we have done yet, we shall only be following in the footsteps of a man who is now a member of the Government.

We have been told by Mr. Haldane that we were entitled to fight the Government, but were fighting them with pin-pricks. Why not use weapons? We do not want to use weapons, even though we are taunted in this way with our restraint. They know that if we have a fault, it is that we are too gentle—not formidable enough. How, then, can anybody contest my statement that we have been incited to real violence, which we have not yet committed.

Mr. Herbert Gladstone himself, though in the witness-box he denied that he counselled our action, yet in a speech which I read to him, told us that the victory of argument alone is not enough. As we cannot hope to win by the force of argument alone, it is necessary to overcome the savage resistance of the Government to our claim for citizenship by other means. He says: "Go on. Fight like the men did." And then, when we show our power and get the people to help us, he comes forward in a manner which would be disgraceful even in the old days of coercion, in a manner which would be thought disgraceful if it was practised in Russia.

Then there is Mr. Lloyd George, who, if any man has done so, has set us an example. His whole career has been a series of revolt. Even as a child he counselled the breaking of school regulations. Then he incited the Welsh Councils to disobey the law. He has authorised the illegal and lawless action of the Passive Resisters, and even to us he has given counsel that we should break the law. He has said that if we do not get the vote—mark these words—we should be justified in adopting the methods which men had to adopt, namely, in pulling down the Hyde Park railings.

Then, as a sign of the way in which men politicians deal with men's interests, we have Lord Morley saying: "We are in India in the presence of a living movement, and a movement for what? For objects which we ourselves have taught them to think are desirable objects, and unless we can somehow reconcile order with satisfaction of those ideas and aspirations, the fault will not be theirs; it will be ours; it will mark the breakdown of British statesmanship."

Apply those words to our case. Remember that we are demanding of Liberal statesmen that which for us is the greatest boon and the most essential right. Remember that we are asking for votes, that we are demanding the franchise, and if the present Government cannot reconcile order with our demand for the vote without delay, it will mark the breakdown of their statesmanship. Yes, their statesmanship has broken down already. They are disgraced. It is only in this Court that they have the smallest hope of getting bolstered up. It is only by keeping us from the judgment of our countrymen that they can expect to be supported in the action that they are taking.

We Make No Apology.

Whatever be the result of the proceedings to-day, we know that by public opinion we shall be acquitted, and I do not want you, sir, to suppose that in all I have said I have wished to make any apology. Far from it. We are here to-day to say that if you call upon us to be bound over we shall go to prison, because our honour forbids us to do anything else, and if we go to prison, when we come out, we shall be ready to issue another bill calling upon the public to compel the House of Commons and compel the Government to do us justice.

MRS. PANKHURST'S SPEECH.

Sir, I want to endorse what my daughter has said, that in my opinion we are proceeded against in this Court by malice on the part of the Government. I want to protest as strongly as she has done. I want to put before you that the very nature of your duties in this Court—although I wish to say nothing disrespectful to you—make you perhaps unfitted to deal with a question which is a political question, as a body of jurymen could do. We are not women who would come into this Court as ordinary law-breakers, and we feel that it is a great indignity—as have felt all the other women who have come into this Court—that for political offences we should come into the ordinary police-court. We do not object to that if from that degradation we shall ultimately succeed in winning political reform for the women of this country.

Mrs. Drummond here is a woman of very great public spirit; she is an admirable wife and mother; she has very great business ability, and she has maintained herself, although a married woman, for many years, and has acquired for herself the admiration and respect of all the people with whom she has had business relations. I do not think I need speak about my daughter. Her abilities and earnestness of purpose are very well known to you. They are young women. I am not, sir. You and I are older, and have had very great and very wide experience of life under different conditions. Before you decide what is to be done with us, I should like you to hear from me a statement of what has brought me into this dock this morning.

Why I am in this Dock.

I was brought up by a father who taught me that it was the duty of his children, boys and girls alike, to realise that they had a duty towards their country; they had to be good citizens. I married a man, whose wife I was, but also his comrade in all his public life. He was, as you know, a distinguished member of your own profession, but he felt it his duty, in addition, to do political work, to interest himself in the welfare of his fellow countrymen and countrywomen. Throughout the whole of my marriage I was associated with him in his public work. In addition to that, as soon as my children were of an age to permit me to leave them, I took to public duties. I was for many years a Guardian of the Poor. For many years I was a member of the School Board, and when that was abolished I was elected on to the Education Committee. My experience in doing that work brought me in contact with many of my own sex, who in my opinion found themselves in deplorable positions because of the state of the English law as it affects women. You in this Court must have had experience of women who would never have come here if married women were afforded by law that claim for maintenance by their husbands which I think in justice should be given to them when they give up their economic independence and are unable to earn a subsistence for themselves. You know how inadequate are the marriage laws to women. You must know, sir, as I have found out in my experience of public life, how abominable, atrocious, and unjust are the divorce laws as they affect women. You know very well that the married woman has no legal right of guardianship of her children. Then, too, the illegitimacy laws; you know that a woman sometimes commits the dreadful crime of infanticide, while her partner, the man who should share her punishment, gets off scot-free. I am afraid that great suffering is inflicted upon women because of these laws, and because of the impossibility that women have of getting legal redress. Because of these things I have tried, with other women, to get some reform of these laws. Women have petitioned members of Parliament, have tried for many, many years to persuade them to do something to alter these laws, to make them more equal, for they believe, as I do, that in the interests of men quite as much as of women it would be a good thing if laws were more equal between both sexes. I believe it would be better for men. I have a son myself, and I sometimes dread to think that my young son may be influenced in his behaviour to the other sex by the encouragement which the law of the land gives to men when they are tempted to take to an immoral life. I have seen, too, that men are encouraged by law to take advantage of the helplessness of women. Many women have thought as I have, and for many, many years women have tried by that influence we have so often been reminded of, to alter these laws, but we have found for many years that that influence counts for nothing. When we went to the House of Commons we used to be told, when we were persistent, that Members of Parliament were not responsible to women, they were responsible only to voters, and that their time was too fully occupied to reform those laws, although they agreed that they needed reforming.

I Have Tried Constitutional Methods.

Ever since my girlhood, a period of about 30 years, I have belonged to organisations to secure for women that political power which I have felt was essential to bringing about those reforms which women need. I have tried constitutional methods. I have been womanly. When you spoke to some of my colleagues the day before yesterday about their being unwomanly, I felt that bitterness which I know every one of them felt in their hearts. We have tried to be womanly, we have tried to use feminine influence, and we have seen that it is of no use. Men who have been impatient have invariably got reforms for their impatience. And they have not our excuse for being impatient.

You had before you in this court yesterday a man who has a vote, a man who had been addressing other men with votes, and he advised action which we would never dream of advising. But I want to say here and now, as a woman who has worked in the way you advised, that I wonder whether this womanly way is not a weakness that has been taken advantage of. I believe that Mr. Will Thorne was right when he said that no action would have been

taken against him if his name had not been mentioned in this court, because it is a very remarkable thing that the authorities are only proceeding against him when goaded to it by the observations which women made here.

Now, while I share in the feeling of indignation which has been expressed to you by my daughter, I have lived longer in the world than she has. Perhaps I can look round the whole question better than she can, but I want to say here, deliberately, to you, that we are here to-day because we are driven here. We have taken this action, because as women—and I want you to understand it is as women we have taken this action—it is because we realise that the condition of our sex is so deplorable that it is our duty even to break the law in order in call attention to the reasons why we do so.

I do not want to say anything which may seem disrespectful to you, or in any way give you offence, but I do want to say that I wish, sir, that you could put yourself into the place of women for a moment before you decide upon this case. My daughter referred to the way in which women are huddled into and out of these police-courts without a fair trial. I want you to realise what a poor hunted creature, without the advantages we have had, must feel.

I have been in prison. I was in Holloway Gaol for five weeks. I was in various parts of the prison. I was in the hospital, and in the ordinary part of the prison, and I tell you, sir, with as much sense of responsibility as if I had taken the oath, that there were women there who have broken no law, who are there because they have been able to make no adequate statement.

You know that women have tried to do something to come to the aid of their own sex. Women are brought up for certain crimes, crimes which men do not understand—I am thinking especially of infanticide—they are brought before a man judge, before a jury of men, who are called upon to decide whether some poor, hunted woman is guilty of murder or not. I put it to you, sir, when we see in the papers, as we often do, a case similar to that of Daisy Lord, for whom a great petition was got up in this country, I want you to realise how we women feel, because we are women, because we are not men, we need some legitimate influence to bear upon our law-makers.

Now, we have tried every way. We have presented larger petitions than were ever presented for any other reform, we have succeeded in holding greater public meetings than men have ever had for any reform, in spite of the difficulty which women have in throwing off their natural diffidence, that desire to escape publicity which we have inherited from generations of our foremothers; we have broken through that. We have faced hostile mobs at street corners, because we were told that we could not have that representation for our taxes which men have won unless we converted the whole of the country to our side. Because we have done this, we have been misrepresented, we have been ridiculed, we have had contempt poured upon us. The ignorant mob at the street corner has been incited to offer us violence, which we have faced unarmed and unprotected by the safeguards which Cabinet Ministers have. We know that we need the protection of the vote even more than men have needed it.

I am here to take upon myself now, sir, as I wish the prosecution had put upon me, the full responsibility for this agitation in its present phase. I want to address you as a woman who has performed the duties of a woman, and, in addition, has performed the duties which ordinary men have had to perform, by earning a living for her children, and educating them. In addition to that, I have been a public officer. I enjoyed for 10 years an official post under the Registrar, and I performed those duties to the satisfaction of the head of the department. After my duty of taking the census was over, I was one of the few Registrars who qualified for a special bonus, and was specially praised for the way in which the work was conducted. Well, sir, I stand before you, having resigned that office when I was told that I must either do that or give up working for this movement.

I want to make you realise that it is a point of honour that if you decide—as I hope you will not decide—to bind us over, that we shall not sign any undertaking, as the Member of Parliament did who was before you yesterday. Perhaps his reason for signing that undertaking may have been that the Prime Minister had given some assurance to the people he claimed to represent that something should be done for them. We have no such assurance. Mr. Birrell told the women who questioned him the other day that he could not say that anything would be done to give an assurance to the women that their claims should be conceded. So, sir, if you decide against us to-day, to prison we must go, because we feel that we should be going back to the hopeless condition this movement was in three years ago if we consented to be bound over to keep the peace which we have never broken, and so, sir, if you decide to bind us over, whether it is for three or six months, we shall submit to the treatment, the degrading treatment, that we have submitted to before.

Although the Government admitted that we are political offenders, and, therefore, ought to be treated as political offenders are invariably treated, we shall be treated as pickpockets and drunkards; we shall be searched. I want you, if you can, as a man, to realise what it means to women like us. We are driven to do this, we are determined to go on with this agitation, because we feel in honour bound. Just as it was the duty of your forefathers, it is our duty to make this world a better place for women than it is to-day.

I was in the hospital at Holloway, and when I was there I heard from one of the beds near me the moans of a woman who was in the pangs of child-birth. I should like you to realise how women feel at helpless little infants breathing their first breath in the atmosphere of a prison. We believe that if we get the vote we will find some more humane way of dealing with women than that. It turned out that that woman was a remand prisoner. She was not guilty, because she was finally acquitted.

We believe that if we get the vote it will mean better conditions for our unfortunate sisters. We know what the condition of the woman worker is. Her condition is very bad. Many women pass through this Court who I believe would not come before you if they were able to live morally and honestly. The average earnings of the women who earn their living in this country are only 7s. 7d. a week. There are women who have been driven to live an immoral life because they cannot earn enough to live decently.

We believe your work would be lightened if we got the vote. Some of us have worked, as I have told you, for many years to help our own sex, and we have been driven to the conclusion that only through legislation can any improvement be effected, and that that legislation can never be effected until we have the same power as men have to bring pressure to bear upon our representatives and upon Governments to give us the necessary legislation.

Now, sir, I do want to say this, that we have not wished to waste your time in any way; we have wished to make you realise that there is another side of the case than that put before you by the prosecution. We want you to use your power—I do not know what value there is in the legal claims that have been put before you as to your power to decide this case—but we want you, sir, if you will, to send us to trial in some place more suitable for the trial of political offenders than an ordinary police court. I do not know what you will do; I do not know what your powers are; but I do think, speaking as a woman to a man, I do say deliberately to you—I think your experience has been a large one—I come here not as an ordinary law-breaker. I should never be here if I had the same kind of laws that the very meanest and commonest of men have—the same power that the wife-beater has, the same power that the drunkard has. I should never be here if I had that power, and I speak for all the women who have come before you and the other magistrates.

This is the only way we can get that power which every citizen should have of deciding how the taxes she contributes to should be spent, and how the laws she has to obey should be made, and until we get that power we shall be here—we are here to-day, and we shall come here over and over again. You must realise how futile it is to settle this question by binding us over to keep the peace. You have tried it; it has failed. Others have tried to do it, and have failed. If you had power to send us to prison, not for six months, but for six years, for 16 years, or for the whole of our lives, the Government must not think that they can stop this agitation. It will go on.

I want to draw your attention to the self-restraint which was shown by our followers on the night of the 13th, after we had been arrested. It only shows that our influence over them is very great, because I think that if they had yielded to their natural impulses, there might have been a breach of the peace on the evening of the 13th. They were very indignant, but our words have always been, "be patient, exercise self-restraint, show our so-called superiors that the criticism of women being hysterical is not true; use no violence, offer yourselves to the violence of others." We are going to win. Our women have taken that advice; if we are in prison they will continue to take that advice.

Well, sir, that is all I have to say to you. We are here not because we are law-breakers; we are here in our efforts to become law-makers.

MRS. DRUMMOND.

I want to point out to you why I came into this Court. I think, if you wished to find out, you will not find that I have ever been in this Court as an ordinary law-breaker; in fact, I am proud to say that I never entered a Police-court until I came here to fight for my political liberty.

I am charged with issuing a bill. I wish to say here, and now, that I do not want to apologise for circulating that bill. I want to say that we did circulate it, because we had lost all faith in the Government, and because we trusted the people. We knew that if we could get the people to the House of Commons there would be a better chance of getting what we have been asking for so many

years. Mrs. Pankhurst has pointed out to you how women have tried to get the vote in a quiet way, and have been no nearer gaining it.

Superintendent Wells has told you that I am an active organiser of this Union, and I rather think that is the reason why I have been included in these proceedings. The Government find that this organisation is becoming so powerful, and so determined, and that women are coming in in every way, coming forward to us, giving all their lives to gain this point. The Government can see for themselves that this agitation is extending all over the country.

Now, I want to say why I am an organiser in this Union, and why I am in this position to-day. It is because I want my sex to be recognised as a person in the eyes of the law. To-day, if I had appeared to you as a mother asking for exemption from vaccination of my child, I should have been told by you and your colleagues that I was not a person in the eyes of the law, and that you could not deal with me. Now, I stand before you on another charge, and in that position you will deal with me. I want my political rights, and I am not sorry at all that I caused that bill to be published, because I made up my mind that nothing else would gain that for which we have been fighting.

It has also been brought to your notice that I spoke in Trafalgar-square. I want to tell you that our two leaders, Mrs. Pankhurst and Miss Christabel Pankhurst, restrained us. They said: "No, you must not be impatient; you must be prepared to try some peaceful means." Now, I say to you that in our speeches we have done what we could to instil into the minds of the people the fact that we did not want them to practise violence. If the people who were round the House of Commons had believed that we had invited them to violence, not even 6,000 policemen would have prevented these people from getting into the House of Commons.

Now, you say we have broken the peace. I should really like you to tell us what is meant by breaking the peace. Mrs. Pankhurst left the Caxton Hall with twelve other women; she was arrested and imprisoned for six weeks. Later on, under the same circumstances, that same number of women left the Caxton Hall, and they were not arrested. Now, in the first place, they broke the peace; in the second place, they did not. We women are fairly at sea as to what is a breach of the peace.

Do you realise what I, as a wife and mother, am wanting? I want women to be looked upon as human beings in the eyes of the law. I do not want the little boy in the street—and I put it down to the status of women legally—to say: "Votes for women, votes for dogs!" I want you to realise, you men, that we want to look after our own interests, and we want justice to be done to our sex.

It is not that we go out into the streets to break the law. I should say that you know that you would never see us before you in any other circumstances.

I do not know what you intend to do to us, but whatever you intend to do, whatever sentence you intend to give us, we look only upon the sentence, we shall take no notice whatever of the binding over to keep the peace. I want to say to you that the agitation will go on—and I can speak on good authority—that it will go on stronger than it has ever done before, because the action which the Government have taken has fired the bosoms of women, who are determined to take up the flag that we women have had to lay down to-day.

I have been twice to prison, and I am prepared to go as many times as necessary; and I say again, we women are prepared to do it for this agitation. I am glad to say, also, that we have left everything in working order, and that the agitation will go on, and we shall find it stronger than it was when we left it. I should like to assure you that whatever you do, it will not stop the agitation that is going on at the present time.

"THE SOUL OF THE MOVEMENT."

The "Christian Commonwealth" for this week has the following editorial note on the sentences which have been passed on our three leaders:—

"The announcement of the severe sentences which have been passed on Mrs. and Miss Christabel Pankhurst and Mrs. Drummond for inciting the public to 'rush' the House of Commons has been received with a certain uneasy feeling of guilt throughout the country. Englishmen have revolted against the idea of sending to prison women of such disinterested motive and pure passion. We desire to express our indignation at the action of the authorities in making this case a police-court charge. . . . All who heard Miss Pankhurst's noble and passionate words, describing 'the horror of women in the police-courts, undefended, unbelievably sentenced at the rate of two a minute,' must have realised the beautiful, loving spirit that is the soul of this movement. As we listened to her Christlike appeal on behalf of the women who are crushed and oppressed all around us, the tragedy of the confinement of such heroic souls within prison cells overwhelmed us."

Beautiful Health & Holiday Home

Unexcelled Scenery of Dean Forest. Lower Severn & Wye Valleys.
Good Roads. Magnificent Scenery. Charming spacious house, 5 acres pretty grounds (altitude 600ft.). Excellent piano; billiard room; bath; tennis; wagonette.
Homelike. Vegetarians Accommodated. Suffragist Rendezvous.
BOARD-RESIDENCE from 27/-. Photos and particulars sent.
HALLAM, Littledean House, Newnham, Gloucestershire

MISS HELEN HARRIS,

FROM MARSHALL & SNELGROVE'S,
MAKES DAY & EVENING GOWNS AT MODERATE PRICES.

Ladies Waited on and Fitted at their
Own Residences by Appointment.

9, DEVONSHIRE ST., PORTLAND PLACE, W.
Tele.: 3983 Mayfair.

A CONCERT

WILL BE HELD AT

KENSINGTON TOWN HALL,

In aid of the Funds for the Women's Social and Political Union.

On **WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 11th,**
At 8.30 p.m.


The following artistes (Suffragists) have kindly given their services:—

Miss GERTRUDE PEPPERCORN, Miss CHRISTINE SILVER,
Miss DOROTHEA WALENN.

And a Singer whose name will shortly be announced.

Tickets, £1 1s., 10s. 6d., 5s., and 2s., to be obtained of George White, 27, Kensington High Street, and Miss Bertha Sharp, 83, Brook Green, W.

MRS. MARY LAYTON, F.R.C.O.—Private Lessons in Singing.
Voice Culture for Singers and Speakers. Singing Classes and Ladies' Choir.—40, Wigmore-street, W., and Stanley House, Milner-street, Chelsea.



MRS. OLIVER,
115, NEW BOND ST.
W.

HATS, DRESSES,
REST GOWNS, &c.

PRICES MODERATE.

THE CAMPAIGN THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY.

WEST OF ENGLAND.

Shop and Committee Rooms: 33, Queen's-road (opposite Art Gallery), Clifton.
Open from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m.

At Homes.

Mondays, 3 to 5.—Victoria Assembly Rooms, Clifton.
Fridays, 8 p.m.—Hannah More Hall, Clifton.

Important Events.

November 20.—Colston Hall Meeting, 8 p.m.
November 27.—Plymouth Guildhall, 8 p.m.

We in the West of England are fighting with all the more vigour and persistency because our beloved leaders are taken from us for a time. Our At Homes are crowded, and we are making many new members. The great event of the week was Mr. Birrell's visit to Bristol on Thursday, and we arranged a meeting for the previous evening, at very short notice. This took place in the St. James's Hall, and was crowded and sympathetic.

So afraid are the Liberals now of our questions that they took the most stringent precautions to keep the women out. Forty minutes before the meeting began they were letting the men in through a tiny gateway, and keeping a sharp look-out, lest any Suffragette should manage to creep through.

We sold VOTES FOR WOMEN, and distributed literature, and when Mr. Birrell arrived we greeted him with "Votes for Women this Session," and this went ringing through the doors until he reached the platform. Then we held our meeting outside, the crowds being evidently more interested in what we were going to do than in Mr. Birrell. One man was turned out of the hall for asking a question about the women. When Mr. Birrell came out we greeted him again with "Votes for Women this Session." Next evening they held a small meeting of about 300 people (it would have been easy to detect a Suffragette among so few!), and outside the police had orders not to allow me to speak near the hall, and if I persisted, to take my platform chair from under me. I therefore spoke from further up the street.

The account of our deputation to Mr. Birrell is unavoidably held over until next week.

I shall be able to say next week who is speaking in place of Mrs. Pankhurst at the Colston Hall. I have been able to send to the treasurer £2 6s. collection, £5 from Mrs. Walters; total, £7 6s. We are in need of money. Please send all donations to 78, Alma-road, Clifton.

Annie Kenney.

LANCASHIRE.

Manchester Office, 116, Portland Street.

At Homes.

Every Friday, 8 to 10, Onward Buildings, Deansgate, Manchester.
Friday, November 6, Portico Library, Mosley Street.
Wednesday, November 25, Great Meeting, Free Trade Hall.
Preston, Wednesdays, 7 to 9, Glover's Court.

The "making of history" during the last few days has been apparent to all who "read" as well as "run," whether in the provinces or nearer the main storm-centre in London, and in Scotland, where (along with Miss Elizabeth Robins) I have been deputising for Mrs. Pankhurst at Glasgow and Paisley, the feeling of nearness to the capital is much more clearly defined than I have noticed on previous visits.

The sentencing of our dauntless three on Saturday, following on the first hand accounts of the last fortnight's doings which we had from Miss Robins, has augmented the rapidly growing strength of public opinion on the question of the "free woman."

In Lancashire feeling is acute on more issues than one. Everything is moving in the right direction. At Bowden on Monday Mrs. Martel was able to point out to an audience largely composed of women that not until they had recognised in Australia, as more and more they are realising to-day in this country, that women must band themselves together independently of all parties, could they bring serious pressure to bear on the Government. At Openshaw, Eccles, and Rochdale large and sympathetic audiences proved how vividly the militant movement has taken hold of the minds of the workers, and how grateful the man voter is, too, that in many cases women are training him to value his citizenship more by the value they place on their claim to the vote.

This week's meetings comprise those at Tottington, Liverpool, Bradford, Old Trafford, Openshaw, Birmingham, and the great Albert Hall meeting in London. On Friday this week we hold a special At Home in the Onward Buildings, Manchester, from 4 to 6, which will precede the usual evening At Home from 8 to

10 in the same place. At the afternoon At Home Mr. Granville Barker will speak, and at both Mrs. Martel and I speak.

As it is probable that, owing to the imprisonment of Mrs. Pankhurst, Miss Pankhurst, and Mrs. Drummond, alterations of plans may from time to time prove inevitable, six small working committees have been appointed in Manchester to deal with specialised work at short notice. It will be the duty of each committee to draw from the general group of members volunteers to help in accomplishing all work in hand.

November 25 is not far off now, and next week I hope to give information as to the latest arrangements made in consequence of Miss Pankhurst's absence. Meanwhile all should concentrate on selling tickets and making the meeting known. Parcels of bills are ready on application to the "Ticket Secretary." Members should carry these bills everywhere, whether in street or car.

I want to draw attention, too, to Mrs. Baines' trial at the Assizes, which open in Leeds on November 6. That there shall be no further travesty of justice in Mrs. Baines' case, as in London with other prisoners, we want expert legal advice, and I invite every woman in Lancashire, Cheshire, and the district to send something to me at once at 116, Portland-street, so that I may send it to the defence fund. Sums intended for this purpose should be earmarked "Mrs. Baines' Defence." So far I have the following to hand over:—5s., Miss Burnett (Glasgow); 5s., Miss Underwood (Glasgow); 5s., Mary E. Gawthorpe. Collections this week per Miss Lomas, 4s. 3d.; Openshaw and Eccles, 5s. 6d.

Mary E. Gawthorpe.

YORKSHIRE.

One of the events of the past week has been the debate in the Cavendish-road Presbyterian Hall, Leeds, when I took the affirmative and Mr. Ellis, of the Leeds University, the negative on a resolution: "That the tactics of the N.W.S.P.U. are the best to secure the enfranchisement of women." The arguments of our opponents were not more up-to-date than that "it was futile and childish to chain oneself to the railings"; they were entirely ignorant of the political history of their country, and had gathered all their information from the local Liberal papers. The audience was largely composed of women, who were much amused at the idea that the tactics of the N.W.S.P.U. had alienated the sympathies of women.

It was a Yorkshire woman who went to hear a debate upon Woman's Suffrage in the House of Commons, and as she came out expressed it as her opinion of the members that "the poor lads had a deal to learn." Yorkshire women are saying the same to-day about the M.P.'s and the clever young men who would teach us our political lessons before they have gone to school in politics. There is, however, a difference in the attitude of the women towards the M.P.'s now; not only do they realise that these men have much to learn, but they intend to teach it to them. Three-quarters of the audience voted in favour of the tactics of the N.W.S.P.U.

Mr. Sydney Buxton at Bradford.

The precautions taken by the Liberal Federation prevented us from obtaining any tickets for admission to the St. George's Hall, when Mr. Sydney Buxton spoke there on Friday evening. The hall was very poorly filled, either because there are not enough Liberals in Bradford to fill it, or because the Bradford Liberals preferred to protest against the action of the Government in refusing votes to women.

Ten to fifteen thousand people assembled outside, and 600 police guarded every entrance to the hall, while in York a special train was in readiness to bring the military into the city if necessary.

We held a huge and enthusiastic protest meeting on the Town Hall steps, and an attempt was made to enter the hall. Miss Hodson announced her intention of entering the building, and, followed by Mrs. Norton and others, made straight for the doors. Cordons of police guarded the end of the street, and these captured the women who led the way, and secured them against the wall. Miss Quin, with other women, made an attempt upon the other side of the hall, whilst Mrs. Blamires, Mrs. Martin, and other women made a rush at the police who guarded the Wakefield-road entrances, only to be pushed back. Inside the hall two men supporters made an interruption, but as the crowd cheering the women outside prevented much of the speeches being heard, no one interfered with them in any way. The crowds outside were in entire sympathy with the women, and Mr. Buxton must have realised how useless imprisonment, abuse, and ridicule are against this great movement.

Adela Pankhurst.

MIDLANDS.

Shop and Committee Rooms: No. 14, Ethel-street, Birmingham.
At Homes.

Birmingham, No. 14, Ethel-street, Monday, 7.30 to 9 p.m.

Birmingham, Edgbaston Assembly Rooms, Wednesday, 3.30 to 5 p.m.

Wolverhampton, The Baths Assembly Rooms, Thursday, 3.30 to 5 p.m.

Important Events.

Birmingham Town Hall Meeting, November 4.

Coventry, Baths Assembly Hall Meeting, November 17.

Midland members will be glad to know that after some unfortunate though unavoidable delay, the office at No. 14, Ethel-street, Birmingham, will be open by the time this report is printed. Our evening At Home on Monday, November 2, will be held there, and we propose to make this occasion one of particular rejoicing, inasmuch as the Midlands have now a definite headquarters. Members are reminded that the primary object of these At Homes is to bring sympathisers and inquirers into closer touch with the movement, and, with this end in view, all should endeavour not only to be present themselves, but to bring friends with them. The same applies to the At Homes now being held on Wednesday afternoons at the Edgbaston Assembly Rooms, which are close to Five Ways. Invitation cards for these At Homes may now be obtained at the office. On Wednesday, October 21, Miss Joachim very kindly came down from London to address us.

Work in connection with our large meeting at the Town Hall on Wednesday, November 4, is taking up all our time. Tickets may be obtained from Miss B. Ryland, 19, Hermitage-road, Edgbaston, Birmingham; prices, 2s. 6d., 1s., 6d., and 3d., the latter for women only. In addition to our usual meetings, we are holding mid-day ones at the factories' gates. The first of these was addressed by Mrs. Bessie Smith and myself on Friday last, and proved most satisfactory.

Wolverhampton.

The usual Thursday afternoon At Home was held here at the Baths Assembly Rooms. The speakers' class was held in the evening, and some excellent speeches were delivered. Very shortly the Midland centre will have a strong corps of speakers ready for any by-election which may arise in the neighbourhood.

Miss Lillian Bradburn will preside at next week's At Home, and I shall speak; the following week Miss Aimee Law will take the chair. A male sympathiser in South Wales is very kindly giving us a thousand invitation cards for these At Homes; members can obtain them from Miss Lillian Freeth, The Dingle, Oaks-crescent, to send to their friends.

Walsall.

The meeting organised by Mrs. Layton and Mr. Weight took place as arranged, viz., at St. Matthew's Institute. It was the first Votes for Women meeting held in this town, and augurs extremely well for the future. From every point of view it was a success. Those desirous of joining the local union should communicate with Mrs. Layton, No. 38, Ablewell-road, Walsall. A collection of £1 15s. 3½d. was taken, and a large quantity of literature sold.

Droitwich.

Mrs. Brewster has kindly offered hospitality if we can send a worker to organise a meeting in this town. We hope soon to avail ourselves of this offer, also that members similarly placed in outlying towns may be able to arrange a like manner of working up their district. A friend at Droitwich has sent us a contribution of 2s. 6d. won in a wager from an anti-suffragist.

Coventry.

The work in connection with this meeting, which is to be held at the Bath Assembly Rooms, is being carried on by the active members, under the guidance of Mrs. Brakewell and Miss Alice Lea. Offers of help should be addressed to the latter at No. 25, Queen's-road, Coventry.

Our delegate on October 13 from this part of the Midlands was Lettice Floyd, of Berkswell. The courage and self-sacrifice which she has displayed spur us on to renewed efforts, and we look forward to giving her a royal welcome on her release.

Donations towards the campaign fund this week have been as follows:—Miss Mary Calway, 6s. 4d. (collected); Mr. Philip Brewster, 2s. 6d.; Miss Berkley, 6s. 6d.; collections, £2 17s. 8d.

Gladice G. Keevil.

READING.

Committee Room: 29, St. Mary's Butts.

Our meetings here each day are more and more successful. The rowdy element has been almost entirely stamped out, and when it does appear it is very feeble.

The last of our series of At Homes was held last Friday, in the Palmer Hall, and it was most encouraging to find that not only were there many new faces, but nearly all of those who had attended our first At Home were with us again. Besides a contingent of college girls there were also a few men, who begged very hard to be allowed to come in, although they knew it was especially a women's meeting. Miss Douglas Smith's speech was listened to with un-

wavering attention, and was punctuated by the audience with many approving cheers. We also made another advance, for several women asked questions at the end. A collection of 6s. 6d. was taken, and I was able to announce a contribution of £2 from Mrs. Stansfield.

The shop in The Butts continues to be a great centre of attraction, and badges are in great demand. We have also a constant stream of women coming in to ask questions about the movement and give us their sympathy. Over and over again do we hear the same comments:—"Why, the papers led us to believe it was all quite different, but now we are going to back you up, and we hope Miss Pankhurst wins her case."

Our final meeting was held in the large Town Hall on Monday evening.

R. A. Scott.

NEWCASTLE.**At Homes.**

Wednesdays 3 to 5, and 8 to 10.—Crosby's Café, Northumberland Street.

Fridays 7 to 9.—Meeting for Women, I.L.P. Institute, Chestnut-street, Wallsend.

We are very sorry to have been obliged to cancel the meeting in the Town Hall on the 26th. We hope, however, to have Mrs. Pankhurst here at the earliest opportunity, and she will have an enthusiastic reception when she is able to come. The work of the week is again of a most encouraging character. New members are enrolled at every At Home. We have moved into the large room at Crosby's Café, and are most anxious to have it filled. Will Newcastle readers please accept here a most cordial invitation to our weekly At Home; gentlemen are invited also; please note. Open-air work is still carried on, in spite of bad weather.

A new sphere of activity is to be started in Wallsend. We have hired the I.L.P. Institute, by the courtesy of the secretary, for meetings for women on Friday evenings. The meeting will begin at 7.0, and all women are cordially invited to come and bring their friends. A most successful meeting was held there on Thursday, 22nd; for the first time men were allowed to come, and as a result the room was packed.

We urgently need help of all kinds. Will members please volunteer to sell a certain number of VOTES FOR WOMEN every week, and also volunteer to make parties to sell papers several times a week? There is no end to our need for speakers, and it is certain that there is a great deal of talent among our Newcastle friends only waiting a chance of development. Volunteers, please!

All information as to our work, literature, newspapers, &c., can be had by applying to Miss New, 37, Rye Hill, Newcastle. Subscriptions to support the local work are urgently needed.

Edith New.

SCOTLAND.

Office, 141, Bath-street, Glasgow.

At Homes.

Wednesday, 4 p.m., 24, Shandwick-place, Edinburgh.

Saturday, 3.30 p.m., 141, Bath-street, Glasgow.

The week's work began with the At Home at Stirling, excellently organised by Miss Neve and Miss Fisher, who, with the kind assistance of Mrs. Pullar and Mrs. Alexander, practically took all the work off our hands. Our only regret was that the large hall could not accommodate all who wished to be present. Stirling is evidently a promising centre for work in the immediate future. At Glasgow and Helensburgh we had also keenly sympathetic audiences. To our great regret, the strain of speaking at so many meetings finally became too much for Miss Robins, and she was unable to keep her engagement in Edinburgh on Friday, where a splendid welcome was awaiting her. The audience, however, greatly appreciated the speeches of Miss Milne Chapman, Miss Lees, Miss Erson Maule, and Miss Una Dugdale. On Saturday Miss Robins, with the unselfishness which has so much endeared her to her Scottish friends, made a great effort to be present at the At Home. The audience again overflowed the hall, and responded most generously to our appeal for a fund for a great meeting to welcome our prisoners as soon as any of them were able to visit Scotland after their release. Miss Gawthorpe delighted the audience with a witty and logical speech. A number of new members gave in their names, and with these we hope to organise further work in the town very shortly.

We intend to have, on Saturday, November 7, a sale of cakes, sweets, and work for funds for our winter's campaign. All are asked to do their best to make this a success.

G. M. Conolan.

LADY would like to ASSIST Lady in PHOTOGRAPHIC BUSINESS. Has had thorough training, and three years' constant practice.—Box 199, "Votes for Women" Office, 4, Clements Inn, W.C.

TO LET, Furnished Bedroom and use of Sitting-room in lady's flat, 10 minutes' walk from Clements Inn. Terms moderate.—Write, R. S., 35, Brooke-street, Holborn.

WANTED.—Good plain COOK, in small family where House ParLOUR-maid is kept. Simple cooking. Separate bedroom and servants' bathroom. Much personal liberty. Wages, £24 and washing. No beer. Excellent references required.—Apply, with full particulars, to Mrs. Blathwayt, Eagle House, Batheaston, Bath.

LOCAL NOTES.

Barnes W.S.P.U.—At the Wednesday evening At Home in Byfield Hall Miss Haig and Miss Stephenson were the speakers. Mrs. Rose was in the chair. Miss Mease sang "The Women's Marseillaise" with so much effect that she was asked to sing it again at the close of the meeting. Miss Stephenson said she was glad to find the anti-Suffragists on the warpath, since nothing helped a cause on like opposition. Miss Haig followed with an interesting speech dealing with her experiences of prison life and the reforms which the Suffragettes had been the means of bringing about. The next monthly At Home will be held on November 11 in the Byfield Hall, and the names of the speakers will be announced in due course.

Brighton and Hove W.S.P.U.—On Sunday, 18th, we held our usual open-air meeting. Miss Hare and I spoke to a large crowd. On Friday, 23rd, we had a capital meeting in the Oddfellows' Hall, Miss Helen Ogston, B.Sc., rivetting the audience by her talented and convincing speech. She impressed upon her hearers that this was not a sex war; the interests of men and women were so bound up together that what was bad for the one was bad for the other. We sold a quantity of literature, and also copies of *VOTES FOR WOMEN*. A collection of 8s. was taken up. On Saturday, 24th, we held an open-air meeting at the Western Boundary. We had a large, attentive audience. On Sunday, 25th inst., Miss H. Ogston spoke at our open-air Level meeting. Our speaker told the large audience that we would only fight the harder because our leaders were in prison. We sold over two dozen *VOTES FOR WOMEN* and some literature. I. G. McKOWN.

Chelsea W.S.P.U.—Our literature secretary, Miss Barry, has forwarded the results of our sale of literature for one year, thinking it may be of general interest to other Unions to compare notes, and an incentive to us to more than double the sum for the next year by pushing the sale of *VOTES FOR WOMEN* in every possible way. The proceeds from October to January were £2 3s. 2d.; January to April, £2 6s. 6d.; April to July, £4; July to October, £2 13s. 11d.; the amount—£11 3s. 7d.—has been forwarded to Clements Inn.

Four large open air meetings have been held this week. Great interest was shown when the speaker described the trial of our leaders at Bow-street, the mention of Miss Christabel Pankhurst's name calling forth renewed applause. During the winter we hope to carry on the work with indoor meetings and At Homes. Will any friends, who can arrange an At Home, or who know of rooms where meetings can be held, communicate either with Miss Haig, or the assistant secretary, 51, Beaufort Mansions? We are anxious to find a hall where a lantern lecture, giving the story of the suffrage movement, can be held. CHARLOTTE BLACKLOCK.

Hendon W.S.P.U.—In place of Miss Christabel Pankhurst, who was unavoidably prevented from fulfilling her engagement to speak, Miss Mary Neal, Miss Louisa Phillips, and Miss Crickmay addressed a crowded audience in Hendon last Friday evening, Mrs. Wyatt, a lady well known locally, being in the chair. The hall was packed, and a good overflow meeting was accommodated in another room. At both the audiences showed much interest in and sympathy with our movement. We are particularly pleased to be able to say, to the honour of Hendon men, that several who had openly avowed their intention of disturbing and breaking up the meeting decided to applaud instead. We enrolled about 20 women as members, and the Men's League was also augmented.

We women in Hendon intend to protest in every possible way against the iniquitous miscarriage of justice by which three of the noblest women of the age were condemned to imprisonment last Saturday. We would urge all those who feel as we do to voice their opinions in the correspondence columns of the daily papers, that the editors may be able to gauge the warmth of the feeling among the public against the present tyrannical and weak Government. We are also prepared to try by means of frequent open-air meetings to rouse the men to show the sincerity of their sympathy by the same means, if they can do nothing more. Never while we have breath will we allow such enormities to be committed without protest.

FRANCES V. CREATON.

Kensington W.S.P.U.—As the National W.S.P.U. has been good enough to send us an organiser—Miss Mary Phillips—we have undertaken much more work this week than had been announced. In addition to our Monday and Friday open-air meetings, the sale of papers and distribution of bills, a special week's campaign in North Kensington has been planned. Miss Phillips, assisted by Miss Postlethwaite and many of our members, will hold two meetings a day; they will canvass, chalk, and distribute bills, the whole leading up to a lantern lecture at St. Mark's Hall, Blenheim-crescent.

We should like to remind our friends of our At Home held every Wednesday at Albert Lodge, by the kind permission of Mr. and Mrs. Cameron Grant. The At Home gives us the opportunity of meeting new friends and making converts, as well as of discussing work in Kensington with those anxious to further it. After the Albert Hall meeting we shall be busy preparing for our grand concert in the Town Hall on November 11. Details will be found in the advertisement columns, so I will only here recommend those interested to order their tickets at once.

The jumble sale will be held in the Tabernacle Hall, St. James's-square, Notting Hill, on Saturday, November 14. The work party which is preparing the goods for sale meets at 7, Palace Gardens-terrace, by kind permission of Lady Home.

LOUISE M. EATES.

Lewisham W.S.P.U.—Our At Home on Friday, October 23, was fairly well attended. Members and visitors greatly appreciated Miss Joachim's address, particularly that portion of it which dealt with her experiences in Holloway. Questions were asked, followed by a lively discussion of Mrs. Travers Symons' action on October 13. The trial of our leaders evoked great interest and sympathy in this district; a large number of men who had been present at the Parliament Square demonstration went—some of them on foot—to Bow-street Police Station, eager to bear witness as to the orderliness of the crowd on October 13. In spite of the cold weather, we had a very large audience on Sunday on Blackheath, where Miss Naylor gave an eloquent account of Saturday's police-court proceedings, and kept the rowdy element in check by her ready wit and brilliant repartee. She answered a great many questions. Over a dozen badges and 85 *VOTES FOR WOMEN* were sold. At our committee meeting it was decided to have a lantern-show meeting in Lewisham soon after the Albert Hall demonstration. Miss Ogston will be our speaker next Sunday on Blackheath. J. A. BOUVIER.

Streatham and District W.S.P.U.—On Thursday afternoon last, a well-attended meeting was held in the studio of our house, 34, Ambleside-avenue. The meeting was advertised in the local paper, and by posters, printed in our colours, which we pasted on our front garden wall, and replaced each morning for five days, after they had been destroyed by hostile hands. Miss Joachim kindly came to speak for us. The chair was taken by myself, and I attempted an appreciation of our splendid leaders, and members of the N.W.S.P.U., like Miss Joachim, and our own local hon. secretary, Miss N. E. Smith, who are so bravely following in their footsteps. Miss Joachim lucidly explained the urgent reasons for the immediate enfranchisement of women, and the absolute necessity for militant tactics. At the request of the meeting she also briefly recounted a few of her experiences during 43 months

in prison. Some literature and badges were sold, and several new members joined us. During the month's imprisonment of our valued hon. secretary, Miss M. E. Smith, I am acting as her representative, and should be very pleased if anyone who will help us in our work will communicate with me at my above address.

ALICE E. WILLSON.

Stoke-upon-Trent W.S.P.U.—The propaganda work in connection with the agitation for women's enfranchisement increases daily in this town, and still more could be accomplished if there were more active helpers. The open-air meetings have always been a great success, a deep impression having been made when the national organiser (Miss Gladice Keevil) visited Stoke-upon-Trent last month and spoke in conjunction with Miss Sylvia Pankhurst. The local Press gave a very true and accurate report of the meeting. On Thursday evening another deep impression was made by Dr. Helena G. Jones, who came down especially from Birmingham to address the meeting in the open air. Every member of the local union greatly appreciated the visit of Dr. Jones, and her speech carried great weight with the audience. It is hoped that she may soon be able to come down to Stoke again; such speakers seem to put new life and enthusiasm into us. Not a stone had been left unturned to make the meeting a huge success in point of numbers present. A sympathiser, Miss Walley, most kindly prepared nearly a thousand announcements, which were carefully distributed, and many strangers were present. Dr. Jones spoke on the evils of the sweated industries and the projected attempt to prohibit married women working in factories, pointing out the great injustice of such prohibition under present conditions; she made an eloquent appeal to the men to help the women in their struggle for the franchise. Questions were invited and ably answered, and after speaking for an hour and a half Dr. Jones had to hurry away to catch the train back to Birmingham. A working man, referring to her speech after she had left, said that it was splendid and "if he had had his wife with him he should have made her join the Union on the spot." On Monday we held the first "Votes for Women" meeting at Longton. Arrangements are being made for a debate at Trent Vale next month. Will all friends and those who are interested in the woman's movement please address all communications to me at No. 22, Penkville-street, Stoke-upon-Trent. The women's cause is destined to be won. May all thinking women join our ranks, and so take part in the great struggle for the freedom and uplifting of womankind. (MRS.) ADELINE REDFERN-WILDE.



Dad Gets a Shock.

Father—"Hullo! What on earth has struck that laundry of ours! Here's actually a white handkerchief that looks white and doesn't smell like a chemical factory."

Anty Drudge—"That's no laundry work. That's Fels-Naptha scap, and I've been showing your wife how to use it. Now you can pay her the money you've been spending on the laundry."

Fels-Naptha soap is an invention. It does what no other soap ever made can do. It makes clothes pure white without boiling or scalding, and with only enough rubbing to rinse out the dirt already loosened.

After you've soaped the clothes with Fels-Naptha and rolled them, you put them to soak

about thirty minutes in cold or lukewarm water. Meanwhile, you're free to do something else.

Then, when you're ready, all you've got to do is to rub the clothes slightly and rinse thoroughly. The wash is done and ready for the line, with little labour on your part, and absolutely no boiling or scalding.

Why not let Fels-Naptha do it?

Fels-Naptha

will do it. Isn't it worth trying?

TREASURER'S NOTE.

We have done it, you see. I knew that we should. We have raised our £20,000 before the Albert Hall meeting. We have done it "handsome," too, after the true Suffragette manner. There are fifty-eight pounds to the good. Now the way has been cleared for the Treasurer to bring out a new financial scheme at the great meeting, which marks a new stage in the history of this agitation. For those who will come to the Albert Hall meeting leaving cheque-book and bank-notes at home, a pretty card, carried out in the colours of the Union, will be supplied, with a pencil attached. They will only have to write name, address, and the amount they are prepared to subscribe to Campaign Fund, and send the card up to the Chairman. We need a fund that will enable us greatly to extend our scheme of operation during the ensuing months.

E. P. L.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE £20,000 FUND.

October 25 to October 27.

£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.		
Already acknowledged	19,448	18	9	Four Suffragettes	0	2	0
Chas. Tower, Esq.	0	10	0	Mrs. Stevens	0	1	0
Miss Louisa Corben	0	10	0	Mrs. Harrison	0	0	6
Mrs. M. Wilcock	5	0	0	J. Martin, Esq.	1	1	0
Miss Helen Whitten	0	2	6	Miss E. Fitzgerald	0	7	6
Mrs. G. Baillie Weaver	1	1	0	Miss Haidee Rodney	0	2	0
Miss M. Cording	0	2	6	Mrs. A. J. C. Rodney	0	10	0
Miss E. K. Grainger	2	0	0	Mrs. Whittaker	1	1	0
Miss Alice Heale	2	2	0	Miss Elfrida Wolf	0	10	0
Mrs. Innes	0	10	6	Miss L. Garrett Anderson			
Sheffield W.S.P.U.	1	7	0	M.D.	100	0	0
Anon.	20	0	0	Miss R. M. Billingham	1	1	0
P. W. Pethick Lawrence, Esq. (Hospitality)	8	15	8	Mrs. R. Blons Smith	1	1	0
Mrs. Newson	1	1	0	"A Friend in Leeds"	0	2	0
Mrs. G. Woods	0	10	0	Anon. (for a badge)	0	1	0
Miss Rose M. Fill	0	10	0	Miss W. Fuller	0	1	0
Miss Margaret Blit, B.Sc., Lond.	0	2	6	"A Sympathiser"	0	10	0
Mrs. Darent Harrison	5	0	0	Mrs. C. Ferguson	0	7	6
Mrs. Massey (lecture fee)	0	10	0	Anon.	2	0	0
Mrs. M. Taylor	50	0	0	Miss A. Major	3	2	0
A Would-be Voter	0	1	0	H. M. L.	0	4	0
Miss Helen Gratton	0	10	0	"A Life-long Liberal Woman"			
"Liberal Woman"	50	0	0	man"	5	5	0
Anon. (St. James' Hall meeting)	1	0	0	"A Friend"	1	1	0
Miss J. C. Melvyn	5	0	0	Mrs. Haarblich	1	0	0
Mrs. J. Baillie Guthrie	1	0	0	The Misses McGowan	0	5	0
Miss Nancy Lightman	0	10	0	Mrs. Rhodes	13	0	0
The Misses Rindoul	0	17	6	Mrs. K. A. W. Thomas	1	0	0
Miss A. M. Goodlife	1	1	0	Mrs. Fraser	0	10	0
Ernest D. Lowy, Esq.	10	0	0	Mrs. Gulich	0	10	0
Miss Handley	0	10	6	Mrs. W. G. Jameson	1	0	0
Lady Knivett	5	0	0	"A Prisoner's Sister"	1	1	0
G. O. J. Stubbs, Esq.	0	10	0	Miss Jean Cameron	0	10	0
Miss C. Woiseley Haig	2	0	0	The Misses MacRae	2	0	0
Scottish W.S.P.U.	2	0	0	Mrs. Mills	0	10	0
Mrs. E. Garrett Anderson, M.D.	10	0	0	"A Friend"	1	0	0
Albert Solomon, Esq.	5	0	0	Hon. Mrs. Wilkinson	1	1	0
Miss Inez V. Clarke	0	2	6	Mrs. G. Barfield	2	0	0
Miss Vida Morris	0	2	0	Miss K. Birnbaum	0	15	0
Miss Mary E. Morris	0	3	0	Per Miss Scott			
Mrs. M. Janet Littlejohn	0	10	6	Mrs. P. Stangfeld	2	0	0
Johannes Meyer, Esq.	1	0	0	Per Miss G. Keen			
Miss A. E. Parsons and Miss D. S. Holmes	0	2	4	Mrs. Ryland	1	0	0
Mrs. E. Drinkwater	0	4	0	Miss B. Ryland	0	13	6
Miss G. C. Hay (by-election)	0	10	6	Per Miss A. Kenney			
Miss Joan H. Drew	0	5	0	Mrs. Morris Fowler	1	0	0
Miss Rose Farmer (collected)	0	2	6	Mrs. Anna Walters	5	0	0
Miss A. E. Willson	1	1	0	Per Miss Gawthorpe			
Miss Juliette Heale	2	2	0	Mrs. Allison	0	5	0
Mrs. Hermon	5	0	0	E. W. Harris, Esq., L.L.D.	0	5	0
Mrs. E. Crowther	5	0	0	Mrs. Schofield	0	5	0
Miss S. G. Strangways	2	0	0	Miss Hewitt	0	2	6
J. Singer, Esq.	0	10	0	Birmingham Labour Church (lecture fee)	1	0	0
Mrs. A. Singer	5	0	0	St. George's Society (lecture fee)	1	0	0
Mrs. Bennett	0	10	0	Miss Hyde	0	5	0
L. B. S.	0	5	0	Miss Abbot	0	10	0
Mrs. Walters	0	2	6	Miss Ferguson	0	10	0
L. L. Y.	0	2	6	Membership entrance fees	7	14	0
				Collections, &c.	227	16	10
				Total	£20,058	7	1

NOW READY.

THE BOUND VOLUME
OF
'VOTES FOR WOMEN.'
Price **10/-** Complete.
(By post 10/6.)

MADAME REBECCA GORDON,
COURT MILLINER
AND
DRESSMAKER

Gowns from 4 Guineas.
Hats from 1 Guinea.

16, BELGRAVE ROAD,
VICTORIA.

Tel. 5513 WESTMINSTER.

FURNITURE,
ANTIQUES.Member of
the W.S.P.U.

GRACE JONES, Art
Adviser,
11, Parkhurst St., Camden Rd., N.

"EL PROGRESO." SPANISH-ENGLISH and SPANISH-FRENCH.
Classes and Private Lessons, Conversational and Commercial. Short
Courses of English for Foreigners.
Please apply: The Directress, 9, Southampton-street, Holborn.

MRS. W. BAKER receives ladies and gentlemen as paying guests.
Special arrangements for students, teachers, &c.
Terms inclusive, 21s. to 31s. 6d. weekly.
109, Elgin Avenue, Maida Hill, London, W.

FRAULEIN ANNA KRAFT, Professor of the London Academy,
Beckingham, Bromley, Streatham, and Wimbledon Schools of
Music, VISITS and RECEIVES Advanced Pupils or Beginners,
for Zither and Mandoline. For terms, apply, 158, Kensington Park-
road, Bayswater, W.

O MY! WHAT'S THIS.

LADIES PLEASE NOTE,
AND KINDLY VOTE,
THE BEST FIREBRICK
IS CALLED 'QUICKFIT.'

Produces a Bright, Cheerful Fire, and the Price is only 2d. each.
SAYES COAL. **SAYES GOLD.**
Shown at the IDEAL HOME EXHIBITION, OLYMPIA, October 9 to 24.
Sold by Oilmen, Ironmongers, and Store.

E. W. ALLEN & CO.,

Typists, Shorthand Writers, & Translators.

39, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.

Telephone 6172 Avenue. Established 1890.

BOOKS FOR WOMEN

THE BURDEN OF WOMEN. By FRANK MOND. Wrapper,
230 pp., 1s. 6d. net; by post, 1s. 6d. Cloth-Gilt, 2s. 6d.
net; by post, 2s. 9d.

"Contains things which ought to be said. . . The real burden is
found to be the relations of the sexes in marriage and particularly in regard
to congenital and other diseases."—*The Morning Leader*.
"A strong plea for the enfranchisement of women."—*The Western Mail*.
"The book's scope is very wide, and it discusses not a few very delicate
topics fearlessly, but always with discretion and force, whilst its general
tone is unexceptional. Some of the statements are startling but painfully
true."—*Aberdeen Free Press*.

THE ENDOWMENT OF MOTHERHOOD. By Dr. M. D.
EDER. Limp canvas, 1s. net; by post, 1s. 2d.

"The author seeks to alter the prevalent views upon sex-morality, and
believes that if Society cannot stand the ventilation of these subjects except
in the boudoir and the smoking room, then the sooner Society is abolished
the better."—*The Pall Mall Gazette*.
"The reader will find outlined a very bold yet eminently practical
scheme to encourage the breeding and rearing of healthy children. Dr.
Eder's views are boldly stated throughout."—*The Bristol Mercury*.

THE COMMON SENSE OF THE WOMAN QUESTION. By
MILLICENT MURBY. Wrapper, 6d. net; by post, 7d.

"This book ought certainly to make Mr. Belford Bax readjust his views
as to women's lack of power to form 'an objective and disinterested judg-
ment,' for a clearer, more moderate, and more precise presentation of the
woman's point of view than this of Miss Murby it would be difficult to find.
To those even who differ from her conclusions will come many plain state-
ments of facts which will bear thinking over."—*T. P.'s Weekly*.

WOMAN: A Few Shrieke. By CONSTANCE SMEDLEY.
Paper, 6d. net; by post, 7d.

"As a vindication of the women's enfranchisement demand, this popular,
clever, lively book is worth reading."—*The Christian Commonwealth*.
"A notable contribution to the literature of the suffragette movement."
The Dundee Advertiser.

THE LEGAL SUBJECTION OF MEN. An Answer to the
Suffragettes. By E. BELFORD BAX and Others. Wrapper,
6d. net; by post, 7d.

"* The authors say—'The Suffragettes have succeeded in inducing
a credulous public to believe that the female sex is groaning under the
weight of the tyranny of man, and the time has come for confronting this
assumption with a plain statement of Law and Fact. The facts show these
individuals to be right in one point—namely, that sex-injustice and sex-
inequality exist, but they exist wholly and solely in favour of women as
against men.'"

Full Catalogues Post Free.

Of all Booksellers or from the Publishers,

THE NEW AGE PRESS, 140, Fleet St. London

HOW WONDERFUL!



Kitty: "Oh! Mollie, have you seen Smart's Invisible Hooks and Eyes?"
 Mollie: "Of course I haven't. They're Invisible; they can't be seen."
 Kitty: "Yes, they can; I have seen them. I saw them AT THE DRAPER'S."

WILL EVERY SUFFRAGIST
 WHEN AT HER DRAPER'S
 remember to purchase

A CARD of SMART'S INVISIBLE HOOKS and EYES.

These Hooks and Eyes, now used all over The British Empire,
 Are the patented invention and property of two members and supporters of
 The Women's Social and Political Union.

WHY PAY RENT?

THE BRITISH HOMES SCHEME enables Policy holders to reap the benefit of their investment during their own lifetime, and in the event of premature death to leave their legal representatives in possession of a comfortable home free from any mortgage charge or encumbrance. Particulars post free.

Good Prospects for Active Agents.

THE
British Homes Assurance Corporation,

LIMITED,
 6, Paul Street, Finsbury, London, E.C.
 M. GREGORY, Managing Director.

MISS FOLKARD,

Artistic Dress and Mantle Maker,

3, HILL'S PLACE, OXFORD CIRCUS, W.

Ladies' Materials made up in January and September.

JUST PUBLISHED.

FOUR SONGS FOR SUFFRAGETTES

By ALICIA ADELAÏDE NEEDHAM

(The Famous Composer.)

1. MARCHING ON.
2. DAUGHTERS OF ENGLAND.
3. FIGHTING ON.
4. CLIPPED WINGS.

The above songs can be had complete for **2s. 6d.** post free, from
 MRS. NEEDHAM'S SECRETARY,
 34, King's Avenue, Clapham Park,
 London, S.W.

MISS EDITH PENNY, TEACHER OF MUSIC AND SINGING.

SPECIALIST IN VOICE IMPROVEMENT AND BREATHING.

For Terms, &c., Address—

85, UPPER GLOUCESTER PLACE, DORSET SQUARE, N.W.

ALLEN-BROWN'S ENGLISH VIOLET TOILET PREPARATIONS

BOX OF SOAP CONTAINING 3 TABLETS, 2/6, post free.
 BOTTLES OF PERFUME, 1/6, 2/6, and 5/3, post free.

SAMPLE OF SOAP, post free, 4d.
 SAMPLE OF SCENT, post free, 4d.

THE MISSES ALLEN-BROWN, F.R.H.S., VIOLET NURSERIES,
 HENFIELD, SUSSEX.

THELMA

Robes et Modes.

59, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, LONDON, W.C.

MISS IRENE SPONG, L. R. A. M.,

SOPRANO (Member of the N.W.S.P.U.)

(Pupil of, and recommended by, Mr. F. BROADBENT & MRS. EDOUARD DE RESZKE.)

For Pupils, At Homes, &c.

Studio: 54, PRINCES AVENUE, MUSWELL HILL, N.; & 9, FITZROY SQUARE, W.C.

DIMOLINE PIANO CO.

SILENCING STOP PIANOS

From 20 Gs. Cash.

Members of the
 W.S.P.U.

11, Parkhurst Rd.,
 Camden Road, N.

ELOCUTION. — GRETA GARNIER

TEACHES:—Voice Culture, Gesture, Oratory, Recitation, Accent, Physical Culture.

Speech Defects Corrected.

Interview by Arrangement:—

LADIES COACHED PRIVATELY.

32, Wigmore-st., W.

E. DAY & CO.,

French Cleaners and Art Dyers,

Nettoyage à Sec.

RECEIVING HOUSES:—

5, Brecknock Rd., Camden Rd., N. | 10, Russell Gdns., Kensington, W.

275, High St., Camden Town, N.W. | 66, Rossllyn Hill, Hampstead, N.W.

CHALLENGE OFFER.

LATEST SELF-FILLING & SELF-CLEANING PEN.

SELF-FILLING & SELF-CLEANING PERFECTION FOUNTAIN PEN (worth 15/-) FOR 5/6



Non-leakable, fills and cleans itself in a moment—a press—a fill.
 Quill withdrawn, sent on approval on receipt of P.O. Your guarantee—Money returned if not fully satisfied. Fine, medium, broad or J. points.
 10/6 Diamond Star Gold Fountain Pen Given Away for 2/6. Twin Feed and Spiral to regulate flow of Ink.

Any of our Readers desiring a really genuine article cannot do better than acquire these Bargains.
 Makers: THE RED LION MANUFACTURING CO., Ltd., 71, High Holborn, LONDON, W.C.
 No other Pen like it for Reliability. Steady flow and smooth writing.

All Pens
 fitted with
 14 Carat
 Solid Gold
 Nib.

AS AN
 ADVERTISEMENT.

Every Pen
 Guaranteed
 & replaced
 free within
 a year.

(Agents Wanted.)